THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE Danish thinker, Sören Kierkegaard (A.D. 1813–1855) takes his place in history as an opponent of philosophical idealism as a setting for Christian faith. The smoothness of the Hegelian dialectic obliterated for him the authentic witness of the Christian consciousness. In recent years a new interest has been awakened in his work by reason of the debt to him which has been acknowledged by Karl Barth and other representatives of the neo-Evangelical movement. And it is symptomatic of this new interest that his writings are being rapidly made accessible to the English reader.

In 1937 the C. W. Daniel Company, London, published an English version of the first of three 'Edifying Discourses in a Different Vein.' It is entitled, 'Purify Your Hearts,' and emphasizes the absoluteness of the individual as distinguished from the mass-man (so glorified in our day !). The second of the Discourses above-named has now appeared under the title *Consider the Lilies*. The translation has been made by A. S. Aldworth and W. S. Ferrie. The price of the volume is 4s. 6d. net. The translators remark that in this volume we are introduced to the Christian answer to anxiety, which is the portion of so many to-day.

In this Discourse it is not so much Kierkegaard the religious philosopher we meet with as Kierkegaard the expositor and the poet. On the poetical or creative side he has a certain affinity with his fellow-countryman and contemporary, Hans Andersen. As witness his two parables of the anxious lily and the wood-pigeon, with which he enriches his exposition of the passage, Mt $6^{24ff.}$.

The whole exposition is an admirable illustration of what we may call the Barthian emphasis on the need of letting God speak to us through the Word. It may appear long-drawn-out by the standards of our day; but it repays quiet and unhurried reading, and there is about it a certain cumulative impressiveness.

We shall not summarize the contents of the Discourse but shall be content to offer a few quotations from it. The first points out how the silence of the lilies of the field and the birds of heaven enhances the value of the gospel for the anxious: 'With these free masters, exacting no fee either of money or of humiliation, there is no misunderstanding possible, for they keep silence—in consideration for the anxious soul. And truly all misunderstanding does arise from speech, or, more precisely, speech, especially when we speak to one another, involves the making of comparisons, as when the happy man says to the anxious, Be glad—and the word spoken implies the addition, Like me. Or as when the strong man says, Be strong—and you understand, Like me. But silence shows deference to anxiety.'

Here is how the thought of 'divine distraction' is illustrated from the passage under consideration: 'When the eye has a fixed stare, it looks steadily into space and always sees one thing, and yet does not see, because, as science explains, it sees its own vision. But then the doctor says, Get the eye to move. And so says the gospel, Distract your mind, look down at the lily and give up staring at your anxiety; look up at the bird and stop staring at your anxiety. And when the eye looks down at

the lily and the tear no longer flows, is it not as if it were the lily that had wiped away the tears? When the eye follows the flight of the bird and the air dries the tear from the eye, is it not as if it were the bird that wiped away the tears?'

Here is how the eminence of man as compared with the lower creation is illustrated: 'In working, man resembles God, who also is in truth a worker. And so when a man works for his food we shall not foolishly say that he is maintaining himself; but more precisely shall we say—and just that we may remind ourselves how glorious it is to be a man!—that he is working for his food along with God. He is working along with God, and so he is God's fellow-worker. Mark, this the bird is not; the bird surely gets its food, but it is not God's fellow-worker. The bird gets its food as a vagabond out in the country gets sustenance, but the farmhand who works for his food speaks of the farmer as his fellow-worker.'

The translation is usually clear in meaning, but sometimes it might have been in more felicitous language. Here is yet another passage, in which it is taught that to seek the Kingdom of God is not to fare forth on a venture of discovery: 'In that place where thou art, there thou remainest, for that is the place appointed thee, and every seeking away from it is, verily, unrighteousness. . . . From an earthquake man flees to safer places, a forest fire drives him to refuge in the open, from the flood he seeks the heights; but should it be that the whole world of things seen sank into decay, then man had in it no other place to which to fly, and for that very reason he remains in his place and seeks first the Kingdom of God.'

Ever since Bergson gave currency to the idea of creative evolution the word 'creative' has been used and abused unsparingly. Anything constructive or vital is sure to be called creative, and beyond that the word has come to be applied to patent medicines and the productions of millinery. The distinction between creation proper, the giving of existence to the non-existent, and constructive work or the giving of new shape to material already existent tends to be quite forgotten. After all, there is only one Creator, and modern man's insistent claim to be 'creative' may be taken as a symptom of that primeval ambition to 'be as gods' which lies at the root of all irreligion.

These reflections are prompted by the title of a book, *Springs of Creative Living*, by Mr. Rollo May (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press; $2.00). The writer is a psychotherapist of experience, and his book deals in the main with psycho-analysis. The book is Christian both in intention and in effect. At the same time the continual use of the word 'creative' tends to convey the idea that every one is or may become a self-contained centre of life and power, an idea which is, of course, profoundly unchristian.

The writer's aim is to supplement the work of psychotherapy with the Christian gospel. The psychotherapist is not really a soul-healer, as the word might indicate. His work is rather to diagnose than to heal. It is, of course, helpful and puts one in the way of healing to have the symptoms of soul-trouble interpreted and the seat of the ailment discovered. But, as Adler was never weary of pointing out, the patient must become his own physician, must summon to his aid spiritual forces strong enough to overcome his weakness.

But from what source can these healing forces be drawn? Freud is frankly pessimistic. He rules religion contemptuously out of court, and he does not believe that reason and scientific progress can prevail to control human passions. Adler bids his patients get out of the prison-house of self and find deliverance in social interest and service. Jung recognized that the want of religion lay at the root of much of the trouble. His words have often been quoted and are very significant. 'Among all my patients in the second half of life—that is to say over thirty-five—there has not been one whose problem in the last resort was not that of finding a religious outlook on life. It is safe to say that every one of them fell ill because he had lost that which the living religions of every age have given to their followers, and none of them has been really healed

who did not regain his religious outlook.' At the same time Jung could give no definite religious guidance to his patients for his own religion was of the most nebulous kind, amounting to nothing more than 'the reaching out of the human soul for basic meaning by which it can live.'

That does not carry us very far. It leaves an obvious gap waiting to be filled. Before attempting to show how Christian faith comes in to fill the gap, the present writer gives a sketch of the problems which the psychotherapist encounters in his work. Freud's system is here represented as a rebellion against the Puritanism of the Victorian age. It may seem so to an American, but we who live nearer have never heard that Vienna was touched with Victorian Puritanism. On the contrary, we had always supposed that Freud's cult of the *libido* was a reflection of the moral looseness of Viennese society. The picture of Victorian man, here given, is exaggerated to the point of caricature, as such pictures usually are. We had understood that Victorian man gave due obedience to the primitive command to 'be fruitful and multiply,' but now we learn with astonishment that in that gloomy age there were men 'married for months or years without a sexual experience because it was their "duty" not to force themselves on their wives.' Such, it seems, was the Victorian age, 'the most unhealthy system of repression which history, perhaps, has ever known,' which gave ample material for the liberating work of the psychotherapist.

The pendulum, however, has now swung to the opposite extreme. An exaggerated worship of freedom and an absolute claim to the right of self-expression have become the watchwords of the post-war years and have led to mental disorders. 'Persons become disintegrated in personality by too much freedom as well as by too little, and so the further contribution of psychotherapy in helping people to find structure for their living is more and more indicated in the present decade.' In other words 'this unchartered freedom tires,' as Wordsworth found, and brings unutterable weariness upon the soul. Then life becomes empty and tasteless. Nothing is of value, nothing is worth doing, vitality simply oozes away. In such a case it is the work of the psychotherapist to endeavour to integrate the personality, to re-collect its energies and direct them into some definite and purposeful channel.

How is this to be accomplished? Here we reach the crux of the whole matter, the point at which the psychotherapist recognizes that he is faced with his most difficult problem. It is usually found that the patient under treatment develops a sense of dependence on the therapist which may become very passionate and unhealthy. Indeed, without some degree of such faith little can be done in the way of healing. It becomes then the task of the therapist to induce his patient to transfer his faith to some more stable and enduring form of reality. 'Secular therapists have a difficult question to answer here: to what or whom shall this emotional force now be attached? The therapist often tells the patient that he must hereafter depend upon "reality" or something to that effect. But what is reality? The person may be instructed to depend upon himself rather than the therapist, but he knows that he must have something more absolute than himself as his frame of reference. He is told, perhaps, to fall in love with humanity by developing social interest, or to find some "big affirmation" which will furnish him with a reality. Such suggestions may work temporarily, but unless the patient finds some reality more adequate his transference will be left hanging in the air.'

Here, then, the Christian therapist can give real help, pointing the sick soul to Christ. 'Christ is that aspect of the creative flow of life upon which one places unconditional trust. Christ is the ultimate one assumes in personality. . . . It is impossible for the counsellor or therapist to prescribe just what form the belief in Christ will take for each and every person. But it is the faith of Christians that this absolute in personality is best exemplified in Jesus Christ. And it is experimentally true that countless persons through the ages have found such a faith to be what they needed as the answer to their disunited selves. It is to this fact that Menninger has reference when he says that religion has been the world's psychiatrist throughout the centuries.'

From this it would appear that the pyscho-therapist at the best can only do what the Christian Church is always striving to do in her cure of souls. And it may be doubted whether for this purpose the terminology of psycho-analysis is more effective than the language of Scripture. There is always a danger that when words and modes of expression are changed some change is at the same time inevitably made in the ideas to be expressed. And so, even granted that some of the ancient hallowed words of salvation have become meaningless to many, granted also that the gospel must be preached to every age in its own tongue, we must see to it that we offer men for their salvation, not some mystical Neo-Platonic Christ, but the incarnate Son of God, crucified and risen.

There is much and wide discussion at present about our aims—war aims and peace aims. Should we state our objective plainly? What kind of 'order' are we planning? Is this the time to deal with such matters? There are many who say: 'What is the good of talk about all this when there is only one thing that matters at present—to win the war?' There are others who contend that we cannot leave things that are vital to our welfare and the welfare of the world till the end of the war, to be settled at the time when there will be much confusion and when what will be needed is just a clearly thought out scheme of life.

The Archbishop of York belongs to the latter school. He has been saying a good deal about the question all over the country, and now he has published his thoughts in a little book with the title *The Hope of a New World* (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net). It contains six broadcast addresses which have already been printed, and a number of other talks and essays. The most interesting of the latter is one, 'Principles of Reconstruction,' which bears closely on the problem mentioned above, and contains some interesting suggestions about the 'new world' of Dr. TEMPLE'S hopes.

He lays down certain principles to begin with, which are relevant to his theme. The first is that every man is a child of God and as such has a status and dignity independent of his membership in any earthly state. The second is that, consequently, personality is sacred, and freedom in whatever is personal (worship, thought, expression) is to be safeguarded as among the primary ends for which the State exists.

These two principles give strong support to some form of democracy as the constitution best suited for developing and expressing the quality of 'personality' in its citizens. We cannot say they *demand* this, for the primary function of a political constitution is to ensure good order without which free personal life is almost impossible. No nation can be coerced into democracy, but it must be open to every nation to adopt it.

The third principle is that, as children of God, men are members of one family, and life should be ordered as far as possible with a view to the promotion of brotherly fellowship among all men. This points to an organization of life which draws together in relations of mutual support the largest practicable number of persons. Emphasis is laid on 'practicable,' because it must not be inferred that a large State is preferable to a small one, or that, if any system of federation be adopted, the more States to be federated the better.

But the principle will at once put us on our guard against the notion of a State founded on and bounded by racial homogeneity; for such a State will be subject in a quite special degree to the temptations of self-centred acquisitiveness and aggression. On the whole, the balance of advantage seems to lie with a federation of States, each small enough to give to the citizens a sense of individual responsibility for its welfare, while the whole group is large enough to combine many peoples of rather diverse traditions and interests, so that these may balance and check one another.

The fourth principle is that men are not dutiful children of God. They are self-centred, and need to be delivered from this by the grace of God. So far as this has not happened, they need to be

restrained in their self-assertiveness and induced by appeals to their self-interest to respect justice in their mutual dealings. The fifth principle follows. Nations exist by God's providential guidance of history and have their part to play in His purpose. But through man's self-centredness national loyalty may be perverted and the nation be made the object of that absolute allegiance which is due to God alone. Thus, if there is to be any approach to a brotherly fellowship of nations, it must be by the same method of so organizing their relationship to one another that national self-interest will itself urge justice in action.

But Dr. TEMPLE attaches the greatest importance (for this purpose) to the growing strength of the conviction and feeling among all Christians that they are united, in and through Christ, in a perfect fellowship. 'Without this I do not expect to see any living and enduring sense of fellowship between the nations. As yet this "ecumenical sense" is feeble; but it is growing fast.' It is a main ground of hope for the Rebirth of Christendom in the future.

But, short of this, the cure for the 'demoniac' national egotism lies (according to the fourth and fifth principles) in a profitable union and organized co-operation of peoples sufficiently close in tradition and interest for this to be voluntarily accepted, yet sufficiently disparate to introduce some efficient checks and balances. Dr. TEMPLE, therefore, does not look to one big federation of peoples but to a number of small ones, and he diffidently names such groups: (*a*) the Danubian group; (*b*) Germany, freed from Prussian domination; (*c*) the Czechs, Slovaks, and Poles; (*d*) the Scandinavian countries; (*e*) Great Britain and France, with, perhaps, Belgium, Luxembourg, and Holland. [No mention of America.]

Within each federal or confederate unit which is established the federal parliament or council, and the executive responsible to it, will, of course, take over the control of all matters of common interest, including foreign policy, and secession would be forbidden. Abraham Lincoln was right in insisting that to permit the secession of the southern States was to approve the dissolution of the United States into its component elements.

There will, therefore, be all the greater need of the more comprehensive League of Nations which shall include the various local federations. What is its authority to be—moral only or coercive? If the League has an effective International Air Force, and if the nations agree to abandon military aviation as part of their own equipment, the League would have the force necessary to carry out its awards. But if not, then all mention of 'sanctions' should be struck out of the Covenant. We should have learnt the lesson of the past—Japan and Manchuria, and Italy and Abyssinia. The conclusions are clear: (1) No sanctions except under the authority of the League; and (2) a new loyalty towards the League in the States-members of it.

Dr. TEMPLE concludes with a reference to the applications of these principles to the economic field. This subject raises some keenly contested issues—Tariffs, Finance, and the Profit motive. It is indispensable that States should consent to submit their Tariffs to the League. There are sound reasons for this, among them the probability that it would undermine the economic nationalism which is an active part of the disease of Europe to-day. It is indispensable also to prevent Finance having positive control in the life of nations. And, finally, it is essential that the Profit-motive (as distinct from a secure but limited return on capital invested) must go.

These points Dr. TEMPLE discusses, not fully but sufficiently to make his purpose clear. Production, he urges, exists for the sake of consumption. The hungry and needy public ought to be the controlling group. We have reached a stage where the grip of Finance and Profit has become intolerable. The principles Dr. TEMPLE lays down should, if carried out, remove the anomalies and disasters of the present system. It is for specialists to turn them into constructive policy and action. The duty of the Christian teacher is discharged when he defines the principles which are implicit in the gospel, and which are essential to the welfare, material as well as spiritual, of mankind.

Spiritual Problems and the War.

IV. Progress.

By the Reverend J. S. Whale, D.D., President of Cheshunt College, Cambridge.

Contemporary events force us to ask an old question with a new urgency: What is the nature and end of man? It is the ultimate question behind the vast debate and the desperate struggles of our time. Ideologies are really anthropologies; they are rival philosophies of human history.

'It was at Godwin's that I met him with Holcroft and Coleridge, where they were disputing fiercely what was the best, Man as he was, or Man as he is to be. "Give me," said Lamb, "Man as he is *not* to be."'[1] Lamb's perverse yet profound remark may remind us that Christian theology repudiates two classic attitudes towards the problem of progress; two estimates of human nature and human history which have never lacked their defenders; on the one hand, a naïve optimism; on the other, a cynical pessimism. The Christian evaluation of history rejects both.

I. It is common form to-day to dismiss liberalism in sociology, politics, and theology as unrealistic and sentimental. In the face of stubborn realities, the complacency of mere idealism is as nauseating as its moral inadequacy. Realism is in the ascendant, as a multitude of writers remind us, until we are almost tired of hearing that modern man is suffering from disillusionment now that the evolutionary optimism of half a century ago is plainly discredited by facts. Even in America the romantic illusions of Utopianism are an ebbing tide, as the mystery of iniquity is seen to be a real and an abiding mystery: not something exceptional, a bad patch which a young civilization like that of the United States will soon mop up, but something typical of all civilizations: not the surface blemish which education, modern science, low-price technics, and three-piece plumbing will rectify, but a deep-seated radical evil which is uncomfortably reminiscent of what Jonathan Edwards knew as original sin. The Americans are not as sure as they were that sin is only an 'evolutionary overhang.' They are no longer confident that what has been called the sin-obsession of Christianity is just so much 'crêpe-hanging.'

'We were getting richer, more numerous, busier, every year,' says Professor Adams of the Capitalist era which arrived overnight in 1850. 'Back in the East, Hermann Melville had written an American classic, Moby Dick; but no one knew or cared what the White Whale signified or whether there was any evil in the Universe. We preferred Emerson, who asked us to be cultured and spiritual, but hopefully looked like the rest of us for spirit to evolve somehow out of matter, and blessed our railroads to a divine use. But the dark cloud in the American sky grew blacker and was spreading.'[2]

The fact is that our generation is rediscovering the abysmal depths of evil in the heart of man, and realizing that Public Enemy Number One is neither ignorance, nor stupidity, nor the defective social environment, but *sin*, which is the deep mysterious root of all these evils.

To be explicit, Christian theology brings a threefold count against the confident optimism of modern civilization.

(1) First, the root error of Utopian idealism is its failure to take a sufficiently tragic view of human nature. It blandly assumes the natural and fundamental goodness of man, shutting its eyes to the fact that under sufficient stress the modern man (and woman) will do deeds of evil as terrible as anything recorded in history.

(2) Christianity's second count against the Utopian humanism of our time is that it clings to that peculiarly modern superstition, man's perfectibility and his inevitable progress. Granted, it says, that darkness covereth the earth and gross darkness the peoples: still, we shall ultimately achieve control over the demonic, irrational, and savage forces which have, admittedly, tried men's faith and broken their hearts in every generation until now. Sin must not become an obsession, therefore. We need not take it too seriously. Humanity will grow out of its youthful difficulties.

The answer to this dogma of human perfectibility is that history does not disclose so neat and simple a pattern. There is a tragic antinomy in the whole world process, to which Christ Himself bears witness

[1] Hazlitt, *Literary Remains*, ii. 396.

[2] *The Epic of America*, 234.

in the Parable of the Wheat and the Tares. They grow together until history reaches its climax of ultimate judgment: the New Testament knows nothing of history as the record of human progress wherein evil is steadily conquered by good. And we know nothing of it either. History is the record of 'an ever-increasing cosmos creating ever-increasing possibilities of chaos.'[1] In other words, as our state of civilization makes progress, the difficulties and dangers which keep it company make progress too. At every instant the difficulties and dangers bear a nearly constant ratio to the state of civilization which we have reached. Do the facts suggest that with our enormously extended mastery of nature, there goes a corresponding mastery of our evil wills, our lusts, our hypocrisies, our boundless egotisms—above all, our fears? They do not. The light of Progress is real; granted. But the new dangers and degradations which are its accompanying shadow are also real. Along with the internal combustion engine there comes slaughter on the roads; along with aviation, bombs. Chemical research in the interests of medicine brings with it phosgene and vesicant dew, mustard gas and arsine. The education which was to have banished crime, also makes crime more efficient, increasing its range. Man's power to do more good is always power to do more evil.

Chateaubriand, nourished like many a young Frenchman at the time of the French Revolution on legends of America, was surprised on landing there to be met at the farmyard gate by a negro girl, thirteen years old. 'We bought maize-cakes, chickens, eggs, and milk and went abroad again with our baskets. I gave my silk handkerchief to the little African girl. It was a slave who welcomed me to the land of liberty.'[2]

(3) But this is not all. Christian doctrine makes yet a third count against the optimistic estimate of human nature. Long before the advent of modern psycho-analysis, Christian doctrine had unmasked much that passes for righteousness and high moral principle. It had insisted that there is no sin so subtle as the sin of 'goodness,' as popularly or legalistically conceived. (See the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican; Lk 18^{10-14}). Righteousness so easily cloaks the sin of self-righteousness. There is no sin so subtly dangerous as the self-sufficiency of the morally religious man. Indeed, all our righteousness is tainted. High-sounding moral principles often include a rationalization of our self-interest. Is it not fatally easy for a class or a nation to be blind to the ways in which its interests condition its moral pronouncements? The egotism of the will to power asserts itself not as egotism of course, but as an idealism of some kind or other. Satan appears as an angel of light. Therefore all culture, including religious culture, is tainted in some sense. Corruption touches even this. Even at his best, man's goodness is poisoned: the canker of self-sufficiency in it only makes his reconciliation with God more rather than less difficult. The whole of the New Testament contrast between grace and works is bound up with this fact. It is fatally easy for man's proud egocentricity to find its supreme illustration in his moral rectitude. We come to understand the great word grace only when we perceive that such a legalistic relation to God is itself sin.

Modern thinkers so diverse as Montaigne and Pascal, Bunyan and Kierkegaard, Nietzsche and Sigmund Freud, have probed the human heart and told the truth about its strength. Their analysis only confirms the radical realism of the Biblical view of man. The congenital weakness of human nature is the submerged rock on which the complacent claims of an optimistic humanism are shipwrecked. Indeed, as Professor Hodges of Reading pointed out in a News-Letter some months back,[3] the gospel that goodwill is the one thing needful is so clearly false, that people who see its falsehood have been driven away from Christianity because they have been led to think that it is the fundamental presupposition of Christian anthropology.

II. But, in the second place, Christian anthropology repudiates a cynical pessimism with equal decisiveness. Pessimism, if it be real and thorough, is as unchristian as an excessive optimism. Thoroughgoing despair is pagan. To despair of man is not unchristian; far from it: but to despair of man in such a way that you are really despairing of God, is blasphemy. Indeed, it is atheism.

Thomas Hobbes, significantly enough, was charged with atheism. And atheism is implicit in his assertion of the utter self-centredness and lovelessness of man. According to Hobbes, human life without the control of the totalitarian State at every point would be 'solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.' Hobbes had no real belief in the redeeming grace of God; he believed in Leviathan.

[1] R. Niebuhr, *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics*, 108.

[2] André Maurois, *Chateaubriand*, 48.

[3] *C.N-L. Supplement*, No. 27.

This view finds its exponents to-day. If the optimists (Social Democrats and others) have affirmed that the function of the State is to make a Utopia of human society, the sole function of the State according to the pessimists is to prevent human society from becoming Hell. Indeed, more than one Continental theologian takes a very similar view, notably Gogarten.

Christian theology repudiates not only the easy optimism of the humanist but also this dark pessimism of the cynic. Mere pessimism would be a poor and pagan answer to a sentimental and irreligious optimism. It is an answer which Christian anthropology has never given so long as it has remained true to the radical realism of the Bible. Modern realism in theology rightly repudiates the social idealism which would claim to be the essence of the gospel; a human society which has been forced by events to rediscover the exceeding sinfulness of sin, has also rediscovered that faith in man is worship of an idol with feet of clay. Blue prints for Utopia are now discredited. No modern theologian has done more to sound out and sustain this note of realism than Reinhold Niebuhr. But we do well to heed his complementary warning that Christians should beware of accepting the habits of a sinful world as the norm of their collective life. Frequently Christians are tempted by their recognition of the sinfulness of human existence to disavow their responsibility for a tolerable social justice.

Christian people in every generation have never been in doubt as to the social logic of the gospel of grace. God's holy will has to be done, even here in Babylon. Neither Holy Scripture nor Church History will ever allow us to make any mistake about this. There is no other way of knowing God than by responding to His claims upon us; and His claims are made just where we live. To attempt to evade this in quietist fashion would be to throw the Bible into the dustbin. It would be to cut ourselves off from the witness of the Holy Spirit in the Church, as He spake by the Prophets, and as He has spoken to the heart of, say, Aquinas, Calvin, Richard Baxter, Thomas Chalmers, and Charles Gore. The gospel can never be unethical without ceasing to be the gospel. From beginning to end it is concerned with moral realities because it is concerned with time and with this strange world of necessity and freedom wherein God has set us to live our life to His glory. In short, the doctrine of progress which is integral to the Christian faith is the specifically Christian doctrine of the Kingdom of God.

III. This brings us to Christian eschatology. Because philosophy seeks to make sense of things, every philosophy includes a teleology of some sort, a doctrine of ends. The real meaning of anything is determined by what it is when completed or perfected; that is, when it has reached the end which was implicit in its beginning.

What is the ultimate meaning of the ongoing life of the whole human race? To the Hebrews with their pragmatic realism and their interest in history, teleology took the special form of eschatology, a doctrine of the End, when the evil of the world would be judged and righted by God Himself. The Prophets always expected this 'Day of the Lord' which should consummate and fully reveal the divine purpose being worked out in history. They interpreted the darkest hour of the battle in the light of the coming victory. The Present Age with all its woe and sin will give place to the Age to Come, a supernatural and supra-historical order of existence which will be the Lord's doing. Thus the Day of the Lord is not an event in history; 'it is such that no other event either could follow or need follow upon it because in it the whole purpose of God is revealed and fulfilled.'[1]

An 'end' to historic time is strictly inconceivable. Just as to conceive of a beginning of time is as impossible as to conceive of no beginning, similarly to conceive of an end—when, so to speak, the eternal clock stops—is as impossible as to conceive of no end, with the clock ticking away for ever and ever.

The idea, then, of an absolute end to history, the End of the World or the Last Judgment, is a *Grenzbegriff*, a symbol standing for the limit of all our conceiving; like the words *Ne plus ultra* on the maps of the old geographers. Eschatology is a symbolic way of expressing the reality and the final consummation of God's purpose within history. The ultimate meaning and nature of history is only disclosed in its end, where God takes history up into eternity, as it were, and history is seen to be part of eternity. The Present Age ends with an Event which is itself the beginning of something new, the eternal Kingdom of God in all its perfection and glory.

The twofold emphasis of Christian eschatology is the familiar and paradoxical theme of the New Testament. On the one hand, the Kingdom of God has come in Jesus Christ, crucified and risen from the dead. The Eternal Now has been given to human experience. On the other hand, the New Testament looks to a future consummation, an

[1] C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching*, 99.

End which is not yet, an eternal order of blessedness in God of which our Christian life in time is the foretaste and first-fruits. Thus the Age to Come, though a present experience, is to be consummated beyond time and death and the passing fashion of the world. That eternal life of which the New Testament speaks is begun now, that it may reach its fruition hereafter under new conditions. Man still has to die though Christ is risen; but death changes its meaning when a man knows that he has already tasted of the life beyond its portals.

This paradox of Christian eschatology is not to be resolved save in terms of a dialectical tension between present experience and future hope. 'Otherworldliness' is the differentia of Christian life in this world. 'The heavenly life alone,' said Neville Figgis, 'lends reality to all schemes of earthly amelioration. It is the life beyond which alone gives value to this; only as we live within the circle of the Ascended Glory shall we really be able for work here.'[1]

By now the development of the human situation is curing us, and seems likely to cure us even more drastically, of trying to put the Catholic and Evangelical Churchmanship of the Christian ages into an exclusive context of social or world improvement, or other such alien ideology. It has to go back to the context to which it belongs, namely, the unworldly, if not the other-worldly. Bunyan's characteristic word, 'the milk and honey is beyond this wilderness,' is what all great Christians have said, Christians whom no one may charge with being ineffectives, while they were on this side of Jordan river. Our citizenship is in heaven. Nothing is more relevant to the predicament in which we now are.

[1] Quoted by F. J. E. Raby in *Theology*, May 1940.

Literature.

FROM PREHISTORIC TIMES TO THE CHRISTIAN ERA.

In his latest volume, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore; $2.50), containing over three hundred pages with numerous notes of the relevant literature, Professor W. F. Albright, the well-known archæologist, has endeavoured to show how man's idea of God developed in the Near East from prehistoric antiquity to the time of Christ. As such a task is not merely an historical one, based on archæological and other data, but involves 'an analysis of the historical patterns which emerge,' he has found it necessary to enter the philosopher's sphere and deal with Hegelianism, the Sociological School, the Encyclopædic-Analytic Tendency in the philosophy of history, and similar matters, as well as to include some final sections on Hellenic culture, Judaism, and Christianity, ending with a discussion on the religion of Jesus, the *Formgeschichte* movement, and the documentary sources of the New Testament. The field is a very wide one, but he has succeeded in presenting his readers with a unique and thoroughly competent treatment of the whole subject. After giving a sketch of the methods by which ancient Near-Eastern history has been developed in the past century, and analysing the basic principles of this development, he deals in the remainder of the volume with the evolution of the idea of God and of man's relation to God in the light of the philosophy of history. In particular, he brings evidence to demonstrate the early date and originality of Israelite monotheism, and also shows that the prophetic movement was a reformation rather than a religious revolution.

Though the volume deals largely with philosophic theories, it contains an up-to-date account of the present state of our archæological knowledge. On some matters in this account, as in the rest of the book, there will no doubt be criticism among some readers. Thus, all scholars may not accept his view that Yahweh was not worshipped in bull form by the northern tribes at Bethel and Dan, but that the golden calf simply formed the pedestal on which the invisible Yahweh stood. But the author's view is probably correct, for archæology in Anatolia, the Hittite lands, and elsewhere in the Near East shows that the most typical appearance of animals in this way is as bearers or supporters of the gods, and we know that the cherubim in Solomon's temple enthroned the invisible glory of God. The author's view also that 'Zerah the Cushite' (2 Ch 14^9) cannot be identified with Osorkon I. either philologically or historically, and that the Hebrew word *kôhēn* ('priest') does not contain the idea of 'soothsayer or diviner' (as one might judge from its meaning in Arabic), is probably

sound. On other matters, such as the author's scheme of chronology, including his date of the Exodus (which he puts about 1290 B.C. during the reign of Ramesses II.), there will be considerable difference among scholars. On this latter point, the author (who admits the probable identity of the Ḫabiru with the Hebrews) shows the weakness of his view by having to assume 'a pre-Israelite' invasion of Palestine by the Hebrews in the Amarna Age. To many the most interesting and important section in the whole volume will be the one on Christ and the New Testament documents, which is a new domain for Professor Albright to enter, but all earnest Biblical readers will be gratified at the conclusions arrived at, warranting as they do the most sanguine faith in God and in His purpose for man. The volume is the most erudite and comprehensive, as well as the most informative, that has come from the author's pen, and should be in every Biblical scholar's library.

J. W. Jack.

CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER BOOKS.

This series has given us some excellent books, such as Mr. Middleton Murry's 'Europe in Travail' and Dr. Oldham's 'The Resurrection of Christendom.' The latest additions are *The Universities in Transformation,* by Mr. Adolf Löwe, and *Christian Discrimination,* by Brother George Every, S.S.M. (Sheldon Press; 1s. 6d. net each). One often wishes that our publishers would, in the American fashion, give us some biographical account of the authors and of their special fitness for the work in hand. From internal evidence I gather that Mr. Löwe is a German who has had experience of German university life and has for seven years taught in Manchester University here. He has thus been able to look at our universities with an eye trained in another milieu, and he is able to express himself in excellent English. His book, for all its limited size, is a very suggestive one. Mr. Löwe considers that the three tasks of a university are: (1) a general or cultural education; (2) a vocational or technical education; and (3) a moral education, dealing with the volitional attitudes of the student, with the aim of forming him according to the 'true' standards of a society that is based on division of labour. The nineteenth century university succeeded wonderfully in these tasks, but it failed in three respects: it failed to take cognisance of decisive changes in the social environment; it ran too much to specialisms of all kinds; and it overdid examinations. The author lays great stress on the cultural element in university education. It should always come first. He is bold enough to suggest curricula, and, according to one of these, the student would have to spend two years on an introductory course of cultural education. Only after that would he be allowed to proceed to a vocational course. The author thinks that the champions of the Old Humanities are right in attacking the unenlightened outlook of the narrow specialists, though the former have their own narrowness to look after.

The author is very definite in his criticism of certain aspects of our university work. The lecture system is bad, for one thing, being often a mere statement of what can be found in a text-book. The examination system is wrong also. He would abolish terminal examinations altogether, and would employ various methods, like the seminar and oral examination, to suit different types of students. There is no doubt that many people who have passed through a university are dissatisfied with the aims and methods they have found there, and there is a general demand for reform. Mr. Löwe's essay is at any rate a serious contribution to this important problem.

The other book, *Christian Discrimination,* is easy to appreciate and difficult to summarize. It might be said to be a book on good taste, not only in 'art' but all round. The author asks us to consider what our way of life is, what kind of recreation we take, what are the values revealed in the houses and furniture we like. We can, he says, only see what those values are, truthfully and objectively, in the light of something older and more permanent than our civilization. That is why the only kind of discrimination which is really possible for us is Christian discrimination. He remarks upon the absence of standards in education, culture, and politics, and the reason for this. He approaches the general subject of good taste from the Christian view of life. And he is alive to the duty of the Church to guide her people about the problems of living, because there is so much in the environment to-day which is, at least, unchristian.

It will be evident that this book has a message. It deals with art, education, worship, leisure, fiction, and all from the standpoint indicated above. The result is a book full of interest, with a good deal to touch the conscience of the intelligent reader, and not a little to inform and inspire his outlook with wisdom and vision. F. J. Rae.

ANALYSIS OF KNOWLEDGE.

In these islands the times are scarcely propitious for studies in pure philosophy. It is difficult to

concentrate the mind sufficiently to follow an argument not to speak of doing adequate justice to it. Despite that, Professor Ledger Wood's *The Analysis of Knowledge* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net) may with confidence be recommended to students of philosophy as a tonic. It is lucidly written and abounds with illustrations of the points made. Epistemology is a very big subject, and Professor Ledger Wood has made his own selection of topics. He is mainly concerned to make two points: epistemology cannot afford to neglect psychology, and all knowledge is of one pattern. As to the first, he rightly censures epistemologists whose psychology is out-moded. As to the latter, he shows how in all knowledge there is 'intent,' a reference to something 'outside.' That is one of the most striking features of cognition and he suggests a psychological, in fact a physico-psychological, explanation of it. Every chapter is suggestive, and if one feels unable to read the book straight through, one will find good mental relaxation in reading the treatment of one topic at a time, for example, solipsism, the ontological argument, the categories, ideals, or any one of many more which might be mentioned, and which the excellent index will reveal. The author's criticisms are penetrating and would by themselves make the book very useful to a student grappling with Berkeley, Hume, Kant, Hegel, and others.

W. D. Niven.

LOVEDALE.

Lovedale is a name to conjure with. It has been described by Professor Victor Murray as 'the largest and best-known missionary institution in Africa, and one of the most famous in the world.' Founded in 1841 it celebrates its centenary this year. A worthy record of its work through the last hundred years is given in *Lovedale, South Africa*, by the Rev. Robert H. W. Shepherd, M.A. (Livingstone Press; 10s. 6d. net). The fact that this bulky volume has been printed and published at Lovedale is itself a striking evidence of the quality of the work.

Lovedale has been fortunate in its Principals, having had only four in the century—Govan, Stewart, Henderson, and Wilkie. Of these the most outstanding was undoubtedly Dr. James Stewart, known to the natives as Somxada the swift strider, a man of adventurous spirit, of far vision, of great force of character, tireless energy, and administrative ability. His Life written by Dr. James Wells is a missionary classic.

Lovedale has seen and passed through many changes and crises, from the troubled days of the Kaffir wars when mission stations were burnt down and Lovedale became for a time a border fort, through years of pestilence and famine, of native unrest and rioting, down to the days of the greater wars of the white man. Throughout it all Lovedale has not only continued and developed its religious and educational work, but has stood forth as the foremost champion of the native in a land where unfortunately racial feeling runs very high. This has brought upon it criticism as bitter as it has been ignorant. The story patiently unfolded in this book may be taken as Lovedale's triumphant vindication.

The volume might perhaps without loss have been made shorter, but on the other hand Lovedale has played so prominent a part in all that concerns the physical, moral, and spiritual welfare of the South African native that its story has to touch upon every aspect of native life. The book accordingly becomes a very instructive history of the relations of black and white in South Africa, and as such it should be read and pondered by all who have to handle that most thorny thicket of problems. With a great record behind it Lovedale enters upon its second century in full vigour and with a reasonable hope that the best is yet to be.

J. H. Morrison.

Of 'modern' translations of the Bible that produced in Chicago by Professors J. M. P. Smith and E. J. Goodspeed ranks as one of the best. The latter scholar has now published a small book, which may be regarded as an introductory volume, under the title *How Came the Bible?* (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press; $1.50). He sketches the history of the Canon, first of the Old Testament and then of the New, and follows this up with an outline history of the English versions from Wyclif onwards, referring also to the Greek, Latin, and German Bibles. Two interesting chapters are devoted to the influence of some modern discoveries, especially certain very ancient Biblical MSS. and the colloquial papyri. Professor Goodspeed includes the Apocrypha in his discussions, and the reader may be inclined to feel that he would be glad if the Protestant Churches would restore it to the place it held before the Reformation. While the work is necessarily sketchy, all that is really fundamental is presented in a simple and intelligible fashion. Naturally there is more stress on the New Testament than on the Old (only one book on the Old Testament is mentioned in the Bibliography), but the whole can be recommended as an introduction to

the subject, which effectively answers the question asked in the title.

The Church History Association of India, Burma, and Ceylon has undertaken an interesting but difficult piece of work in publishing *A Calendar for the Church in India, Burma, and Ceylon* (As. 4). It is a calendar of saints, and contains about seventy names partly of saints common to the churches of East and West, together with pioneer missionaries and leaders of the Church in India. Short biographical notices of half of these are added. The little book should be useful in widening the outlook of Indian Christians and illustrating the unity of the Church.

The *ABC of the Christian Religion*, by the Rt. Rev. Walter Carey, D.D. (Eyre & Spottiswoode; 1s. net), is commended in a Foreword by the Bishop of London. It is, as its title indicates, a simple statement of the Christian fundamentals. To do this effectively is no easy task and it may be said the writer has achieved a great degree of success. His presentation of the truth is perhaps a little too much coloured by Church of England forms and practices, but his exposition is plain and understandable, and, above all, it is pervaded by a warmth of faith and affection which makes a strong appeal.

The Rev. John E. McIntyre, Edinburgh, has published a pamphlet, *Jesus, His Fight* (W. F. Henderson, Edinburgh; 2d.), in which, on the basis of Jn 18^{37}, he makes a vigorous plea for the presentation of Jesus as He was known by the disciples and by the common people as against the theological statement of Him through the Creeds. Our theology should live and move in the world of the Synoptic Gospels.

All the world has been asking how London is taking it, what is the reaction of its people to the nightly alarms, the thunder of guns, the crash of bombs, and the fiery rain of death. The unanimous answer is that London is taking it magnificently. An equally interesting question is, What are the London preachers saying to their people to nerve their hearts and sustain their faith? An answer to this question may be found in *This is the Victory*, by the Rev. Leslie D. Weatherhead (Hodder and Stoughton; 5s. net). It contains sixteen sermons all of which deal in one way or another with Faith and its allies. These sermons, preached literally while bombs dropped and houses rocked, have a historical interest, but their supreme value is religious, for they convey vital evangelical messages fitted to give courage to the hearers and shed abroad in their hearts the peace of God. They are most timely and deserve to reach a very wide audience.

The Destined Lord of the Universe, by Mr. D. Stewart MacColl, M.D., M.S. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 3s. 6d. net), is declared in its sub-title to be 'Studies in the Book of Revelation and other Biblical Prophecies.' The writer, born and educated in Scotland, did his life work in Australia where he became a well-known and forceful speaker at conventions. The theme that most deeply moved him and dominated all his thought was the hope of the Second Advent, and this book has been compiled by his daughter from his addresses on that theme. He held the views which were impressively preached in Scotland a generation ago by the Bonars. He has no patience with 'that farrago of nonsense about dates,' but he passionately believes in the imminence of the Lord's return. He shows a great mastery of prophetical literature, and his book should bring comfort to many in these so disturbed and evil times.

The Rev. F. H. Wales, B.D., in a little book entitled *The Forgiveness of Sins* (Milford; 3s. 6d. net), seeks to trace simply the development of the idea of reconciliation, which has its beginnings in the human instinct of forgiveness. He leads his readers up to the Pauline doctrine in which the Divine meaning of the Cross of Calvary appears. But he does not discuss theories of the Atonement. He has himself read widely among the English and French expositors and quotes largely from them. Indeed, his work is in great part a catena of quotations; but it is obviously his intention to stand aside and let the expositors speak, and for this many of his readers will be grateful. He takes a knowledge of Greek, Latin, and French on the part of his readers for granted.

Every reader will peruse with sympathy Dr. Graham Scroggie's most recent book, written after the death of his wife. It is entitled *What About Heaven?* (Pickering & Inglis; 3s. 6d. net). It does not profess to be 'a treatise on eschatology but the meditation of a sorely bereaved heart.' It is, as one would expect, very closely Biblical and deals in the main with the answer from Revelation to the question regarding the Intermediate State and the Ultimate State. Dr. Scroggie is on the whole a safe guide in matters of Scripture interpretation though one feels at times that he is too literal

and prosaic, as in his distinction of the Three Judgments. How difficult it always is to give worthy expression to these high mysteries the moment one travels beyond the great words of Scripture! Yet this book will doubtless bring healing balm and renewal of hope to many sorrowing hearts.

Does God Care about the War—or Us? (S.P.C.K.; 1s. net), by the Rev. T. H. Sutcliffe, M.A., consists of a series of popular talks on religion specially written for soldiers, sailors, and airmen. The title appears to cover the first two of the five talks. There are also talks on the Life after Death and the Lord's Prayer. The style is direct and unconventional, and the author makes his points well. We have pleasure in commending his little book.

Mrs. Rebecca J. Parker, who is already known by her life of the Sadhu Sundar Singh, has written a series of stories of Indian Christians under the title of *How They Found Christ* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). These spiritual biographies are very brief as the book contains seventeen in all, but they are remarkable stories. The best known of those whose record is here given are the Pandita Ramabai and the Christian poet Tilak, but every one is of living interest. What could be more romantic than the conversion of Dilawar Khan, the Afghan robber chief, or what more touching than the almost lifelong pilgrimage of Vetha Manikam, the lonely Nepalese girl. This is a book which will mightily stimulate faith in the power of the gospel.

How We Got the Gospels, by the Rev. Fred. Whitehead (Stockwell; 1s. 6d. net), is a little book which rather belies its title. After a few pages dealing with the formation of the four Gospels the writer goes on to give a collection of brief notes on such topics as the names given to our Lord, Faith, the Inn, Mansions, etc. These are set down without any logical order, and frankly it is difficult to see what the writer would be at.

It is natural that at such a time as this books of a devotional character should appear in answer to a demand. We have already noticed some recently. Others are mentioned below. First in importance and value is *The Weapons of a Christian,* by the Rev. Bernard Clements, O.S.B. (S.C.M.; 1s. 3d. net). It consists of talks broadcast, most of it to the forces, and deals with Prayer, the Bible, and the Sacraments, as well as the start and growth of the religious life. The main characteristic of the book is its combination of common sense with spiritual insight. Mr. Clements talks directly to the average man, and this man he knows very thoroughly. He is a helpful guide, and it would be a blessing to many a young man in one of the services to have this little book put into his hands. We must not omit to notice the extraordinarily skilful use of illustration in these talks. It is always to the point and often surprisingly novel.

In His Name, by Mr. N. A. Turner-Smith (S.C.M.; 1s. net), is a book of guided prayer for corporate and private use. The prayers are, we imagine, for the most part the compiler's own, and they are generally good. They are based on Scripture, and will be found helpful and uplifting. In the table of contents the headings are practically all great Bible sayings, and the prayers following each are entirely in the spirit of these great creative words.

Prayer Time with Juniors, by Miss Vera Pewtress (National Sunday School Union; 1s. 6d. net), is an endeavour to meet what is a really clamant need—good prayers for school use. It is one of the hardest things in the world to write a prayer that children can use. We have examined many books of school prayers, and found few that are not more suited to adults than to children. Even in this book, which is a very good one, we find words like 'ideal,' 'loyalty,' 'luxuriant' which are certainly not words that 'juniors' would use or understand. However, to do Miss Pewtress justice, such expressions are not numerous. This book is well planned; the petitions cover a large part of life and of Scripture teaching. Moreover, the prayers are brief and are suitably broken up by responses. We recommend teachers, both in day school and Sunday school, to make trial of it. It will be a good guide at any rate.

A short time ago Professor T. W. Manson of Manchester broadcast a series of talks on the history of Israel. Those who heard them will be glad to know that they have been printed as a small volume—*God and the Nations* (S.C.M.; 1s. net)—and are now available as a permanent statement of the facts. Others, who missed the talks, will also find them very useful. They contain an admirable summary of the history of Israel, with the right stress on economic and social conditions and on the message of the great prophets. Equally valuable is the way in which Professor Manson has shown how the message of the prophets is applicable to our own position to-day, giving us warning, instruction, and inspiration. There can be few readers who would not gain something worth having from this little book.

The Historic Church and Present Need.

V. The churches and the Church.

By Professor John Foster, M.A., Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham.

I have tried in this series of articles to keep our feet upon the earth. But some one says, 'It is easy to talk about the Church. All that we know is the churches.' This must give us pause. It is something not to be overlooked by any one discussing present need.

I was not assigned to the group which at Madras worked on Co-operation and Unity.[1] One day I met one of its most responsible members rubbing his hands with glee. 'The delegates of the Younger Churches,' he said, 'when they frame a resolution, do not dress it up or tone it down as we do. Listen to this :

> The divisions of Christendom are seen in their worst light on the mission field . . . disgraceful competition . . . wasteful overlapping . . . a stumbling-block to the faithful . . . a mockery to those without . . . bringing dishonour to the religion of our Master . . . the scandalous effects of our divisions.'

Perhaps it was the difference between intemperate youth and circumspect middle age. But any one who wrote of our divisions from the midst of the Madras Conference of 1938 would have written strongly. For a blessed period of three weeks it was as though they did not exist. We knew, as not one of us had known before, what it meant to belong to the Universal Church. Am I exaggerating if I say that we knew it as no one in nineteen centuries of the Church's history had had a chance to know ?[2]

The crowded events of the twenty-seven months since make those experiences seem distant. But they are some of the things about which I nowadays most often feel called to preach. It is no small consolation, while European Christendom is being battered into ruins, to give to God's people the assurance that the day of the Universal Church has come, that His Church was never so widespread, that His redeemed family is the central point of His working for the achievement of His purposes in the world.

Those are high-sounding words. Are they anything more ? I have sometimes doubted when my sermon was over, hymn sung, blessing given, and I was standing at the church door. We belong to the Universal Church, but consider its local manifestation : a rival show across the way, the spire of another just down the street, everything a reminder of that which is partial, divided, ineffectual. In one respect I disagree with that resolution, 'The divisions of Christendom are seen in their worst light on the mission field.' As I look round here at home I doubt if that is true any longer. Still, let us start with the Younger Churches :

(1) 'A mockery to those without.' Dr. Hu Shih, leader of China's Renaissance, is a man who believes that his country had better risk losing some features of her old culture rather than fail to grasp with both hands the blessings of Western science and the standard of life made possible by our machine-civilization.[3] This attitude prevails among Chinese nationalists—in marked contrast to that of the *khaddar*[4]-clad followers of Mr. Gandhi, who urge India's return to the spinning-wheel as part of the national salvation. One might have expected this openness to all that is best from abroad to imply an open ear to the message of the Church. But this is a sample of what Dr. Hu Shih has to say about religion :

> 'It is well for you to say that Christianity is better than our Taoism and Buddhism'

(I think he is ready to agree so far—it would be entirely in accordance with his principles for him to do so),

> 'But in Christianity there are one or two hundred different denominations attacking each other. Which denomination shall we adopt ?'

He exaggerates—it is not two hundred. But in China there are 132 missionary societies, which seems a sufficient advertisement of our shame. The work of the most important of these has resulted in the growth of major churches to the

[1] *The Life of the Church* (Tambaram Madras Series IV.) 397–404, especially 402.

[2] Second of this series of articles, December number, 91 f.

[3] *China Christian Year Book*, 1929, p. 115.

[4] Cloth produced on the hand-loom.

number of twelve, the largest being the federal union of churches which is called the Church of Christ in China. This comprises nearly one-quarter of the whole of non-Roman Christians. These twelve major churches make up 86 per cent. of the total. The remaining 14 per cent., the work of some forty missionary societies, may be described as the 'small fancies' of left-wing Protestantism, some of them in their exclusive intolerance being a match for the Church of Rome itself.

It is bad enough. And I was told of worse in India. I never fail to feel the sting of shame in that story of the low-caste tribe which had all but made up its mind to come over to the Christian Church. Then a clever Hindu lawyer pointed out that as a community they were scattered over a wide territory. In different parts of it different missions were at work. Hinduism stands for caste unity; Christianity is that which divides. The lawyer won his point, and the mass-movement did not happen. In discussing India's political future we often point to her religions as a divisive force: communal strife between Hindu and Muslim; within Hinduism the separation of high-caste from low; the exclusion of the 'untouchables.' Did we realize that the Hindu can point the finger of scorn to our religion as threatening even such unity as exists? 'A mockery to those without': so it is.

Some, so far from agreeing that our divisions mean failure, believe that diversity, being a sign of vitality, is an earnest of success. There is something in this. I suggested in a previous article [1] that the typical expression of revival in the medieval Church is a new monastic order. Similarly in the parts of the Western Church which broke with the Roman hierarchy a burst of new life takes shape in a new community—a denomination. The tragedy is that, whereas in the Middle Ages the Church was generally ready to expand its boundaries and reconsider its rules in order to make room for these disturbances in its routine, too often in Protestant communions a spring of new life has been unrecognized, or unwelcomed by those who stood for traditional church order. This is especially so in England. Through a proper concern for preserving the national unity in the dangers of Elizabeth's reign, our country developed a habit—and the habit continued right down to the Anglican Revival in the middle of last century: Leaders of movements of distinctive religious vitality were told to get down, and, when they refused, to get out. They ought to have been taken up and assimilated into the life of an undivided English Church. I am willing to agree that often diversity is the sign of an abounding vitality, of manifold revival, of movements of the Spirit in unexpected places and people. But when such diversity results in division, something has gone wrong: it may be something in the revival movement. It may be something in the unrevived and unresponsive body of the Church. Diversity is often due to the blessing of God; division is always due to man's mishandling of it.

What division has meant historically to the Church standing over against the non-Christian world is best seen by turning to two events which Professor Latourette labels 'the first and second great losses of territory.' [2] The first is the rise of Islam in the seventh century. The second is the conversion to Islam of the Mongol rulers of Asia about the year 1300.

When, with the German invasions of the fifth century, crisis came to the lands of the Western Church, that Church, under the rising power of the Bishop of Rome, was drawn together into a unity strong enough not only to withstand the shocks of change but to re-expand among the new peoples of Europe. Two centuries later the Church at the eastern end of the Mediterranean had to face the swift outpouring of the Arab power of Islam. Its condition was vastly different: The Church of the East (Nestorian), with its Catholicos at the Persian capital and its missionaries already reaching out towards China,[3] had severed its connexion with the Church of the Roman Empire. The West Syrian (Jacobite), Armenian, Coptic, and Ethiopic Churches were disaffected; these were all Monophysite, but they were subdivided among themselves in ways which sometimes shook them even from their local loyalties. As a result, the country of our Lord's earthly life, scenes of the labours of His Apostles, homes of the greatest of the Fathers, were overrun by the invader. They became Muslim lands with a small Christian remnant, lands which to this day claim some of the most sacrificial and apparently unrewarded of missionary service. Nearly two hundred and fifty years ago the Dean of Norwich [4] used this illustration, the triumph of Islam in the Near East, as a warning to Christians in England against their divisions:

> 'A sad memento to us: for of all Christian Churches now remaining in the world, which is

[1] January number, 132.

[2] *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, ii. 286 ff., 308 ff.

[3] My *Church of the T'ang Dynasty*, 32 ff.

[4] Humphrey Prideaux, *Life of Mahomet* (1697), a polemical tract against the Deists.

there that hath more reason than we at this present, to learn instruction from this example, and to take warning therefrom ? '

In the year 1271 Pope Gregory X. received a request immediately upon his ascending the throne of St. Peter. It came from the ruler of the greatest empire the world has ever seen—Kublai Khan. The rule of the Mongols extended from the Ural Mountains to the Himalayas, from the China Sea to the River Danube.[1] The Great Khan sent Nicolo and Maffeo Polo, Marco's father and uncle, as his ambassadors to the Pope, saying,

> ' You shall go to your High Priest and shall pray him on our behalf to send me a hundred men skilled in your religion . . . and so I shall be baptized, and when I shall be baptized all my barons and great men will be baptized, and then their subjects will receive baptism, and so there will be more Christians here than there are in your parts.' [2]

Taken along with other evidence of the times—the number of Nestorians in high official position, baptisms even in the Imperial family, the presence of the Church of the East, often a minority, but in some places in strength, across Central Asia to the China Sea—this record makes it impossible to doubt the chances of such a mass movement as Kublai foretold. The Mongols were wavering. Their choice of a religion, as they ceased to be mere destroyers and settled down to become a State, was in the balance. Their own primitive Nature-worship was falling away. As alternatives they had met in their own territory Buddhism in the East, Islam in the West, Christianity thinly scattered over the whole. Which was it to be ?

The opportunity was lost. It is easy to blame the Pope's preoccupation with European politics, especially the two-centuries-old struggle with Germany. If the Pope had been less an Italian Prince and more a statesman of the Kingdom of God he might have seen that here was the greatest chance in the whole history of the expansion of the Church. A later Pope, Nicholas IV., who had been General of the Franciscan Order, did in 1289 despatch missionaries to the Emperor Kublai Khan. They were late : the Mongols had begun to make another choice. They were few—a mere handful, never approaching the asked-for hundred. Most important of all, the Catholics who might have been as new blood infused into a decadent body, never got near, except in jealousy and strife, to the Nestorians who were before them in the field.

> ' So passed what may be described as the greatest might-have-been in the history of the Church. The Mongol or Turkish stock had been willing for a couple of generations to accept Christianity and not Islam as their national faith. . . . *Had it been presented to them by the oriental representatives of an undivided Christianity* there is little doubt that they would have done so. If this had happened, what might not have followed ? ' [3]

This is one of the points in history where one can hardly help going off into day-dreams. In the Near East the rule of the Turk might have been a blessing not a curse, if his ancestors had chosen Christianity in the thirteenth century, instead of his waiting till our own time and then choosing only non-religious benefits of our way of life. Central Asia might not have been depopulated by that savage reversion to the nomad destroyer, Tamerlane ; it might not have been for Christianity to-day the greatest closed area on the earth's surface, Muslim where it is not Bolshevik. China might not have been cut off from the Church's ministrations for two hundred years ; and (since Moghul is but a re-writing of Mongol) the sixteenth-century conquerors of North India might have been Christian—and their descendants now. And all if two branches of the Church had been able to come together in united witness !

' A mockery to those without ' : as one reads the record of history one must ask, Are these strong words strong enough for our divisions which then and now have thwarted the purposes of God ?

(2) ' A stumbling-block to the faithful.' A colleague in China conducted a mission which was largely attended by students from non-Christian colleges. He left a group of inquirers in the charge of two keen and capable Chinese ministers. Weeks afterwards he found to his horror that the class had been allowed to melt away. They explained that the mission had been a Y.M.C.A. affair, and they thought it might cause misunderstanding if they, ministers of the —— Church, stepped in to prepare these men for baptism. They had been brought up with such a healthy horror of sheep-stealing that it made them neglect to gather the lost sheep into any fold at all. There you see what that Madras resolution means when it says :

> ' Co-operation in the great evangelistic task stops at the point where pastoral care is needed

[1] Eileen Power, *Medieval People*, Pelican Books A 19 —a sixpennyworth not to be missed ; there is a splendid map, 48.

[2] A. C. Moule, *Christians in China before 1550*, 136 f.

[3] W. A. Wigram, *The Assyrians and their Neighbours*, 139 (italics mine).

> for the building up of the Church. We can act together in the presentation of the Gospel . . . but in the next necessary stage co-operation breaks down owing to divided church loyalty.'

The illustrations above are examples of that breakdown: Comity—division of the territory among us so that we do not compete and overlap—was the reason which prevented that low-caste Indian tribe from coming over. Co-operation was the thing which seemed to make impossible pastoral care of converts of a joint mission. But there is another, and more positive, side to all this: In the Younger Churches how far we all have moved from anything like denominational isolation, moved by the pressure of a common need. Consider:

A Quaker reproved John Wesley—

> 'because he found we were not led by the Spirit; for we fixed times of preaching beforehand; whereas we ought to do nothing unless we were sensibly moved thereto by the Holy Ghost. . . . This was to regard the letter that killeth.' [1]

John, unrepentant and unpacific, replied, 'God grant that I may so regard it all the days of my life!' I go regularly to a Quaker Meeting to preach. When first invited, I marvelled, remembering John: 'Do you have fixed times of preaching?' The answer is that it is a mission in a city slum, with a mission service such as any one of our churches would run in a similar environment. If that is so, when you move from the highly privileged and deeply pious circles to which many Friends have always belonged to a mission in a semi-pagan slum, how much further has the process gone in foreign missionary work? 'Meeting House?' That is what all of us have to use in translating 'church' into the Chinese language; there is no special evolution of a sacred term like κυριακὸν or ἐκκλησία. A ministry? Friends have to have trained, professional, and salaried staff, as much as any other mission. Silence until the Spirit moves? No, you cannot do that with the heathen who do not know what it is all about. You must start further back.

Members of the Society of Friends will forgive me for using them as an easy illustration. The same is true of any one of our 'unhappy divisions.' In so far as denominational distinctions represent a negative reaction against abuses existing in the Church as the Church then was in Europe, they are meaningless except in the land of their origin. Even there it may be true that some extremes have served their purpose once the abuse which caused them has passed into oblivion. It is not unfaithfulness if we are moving from these distinctions towards a position which is more *catholic*, *i.e.* more common—belonging to that common heritage which lies beyond and before our divisions.

Congregationalists—descendants, remember, of the Independents who protested against a national Church—form next to Presbyterians the main element in the Church of Christ in China, the most ambitious attempt at a national expression of Protestant Christianity. One Congregationalist missionary in India complained to me that something was going far wrong with one of the neighbouring churches. 'In the old days I, as a senior missionary, would have stepped in and put it right. But now, with the progress of devolution, it is another, and an Indian, minister's pastorate. We ought to have some central authority . . .' 'A bishop?' said I. 'You don't seem to me to be talking Congregationalism.' 'Congregationalism?' he replied. '*They are not up to that yet.*' There is much to be said for his contention: some of our later forms of church order do imply a long training in something more elementary, more authoritarian. Having been a missionary, I know how the monarchical episcopate spread through the Early Church. I have seen many monarchical episcopoi—Congregationalist, Baptist, Presbyterian, Methodist, as well as Anglican—ruling their churches with a firm and fatherly hand, as young churches need, and love, to be ruled.

The same is true of worship. I have already quoted the Madras finding which said that the missionary is to 'embody and transmit the experience of the universal Church.' It goes on: 'To this end he should be familiar with types of worship other than those of his own church.' [2] I have been appalled at the results of transferring some worship traditions, away from the environment which produced them, to a young church in a non-Christian land. It has led to horrible irreverences when raw congregations have been led straight in to 'free' worship without that centuries-old accumulation of experience which worthy 'free' worship presupposes: no ingrained habits of reverence, no steeping in the devotions of the Psalter, no deep knowledge even of New Testament scriptures, no worthy hymn-book long contributing to the language of prayer, no experience of the discipline of a liturgy.

At one time I was responsible for daily worship in a Chinese college chapel. I did not make them keep all the canonical hours, but morning and evening we used the sort of daily office in which

[1] *Journal*, 6th July 1739.

[2] *The Life of the Church*, 253.

medieval monks raised their souls to God.[1] Some of my colleagues were surprised. I felt that I was standing for 'the experience of the Universal Church,' and standing for it as that which fills up the negative aspects, corrects the partial emphases, of the narrower denominational heritage. I was explaining it thus to a visitor, when he remarked, 'That's funny. In the field where my work is, they do the liturgy beautifully. I am having to put all my energy into teaching *ex tempore* prayer.' I am a Methodist minister; my visitor was a distinguished member of one of the celibate orders of Anglo-Catholicism.

It is time we came together. I do not advocate the casting off of any positive denominational heritage. No scheme of Church union is worth considering which waters down distinctive features, so that there shall be nothing for any one to object to. A Church so unified would contain nothing a man would die for either. Church Re-union is not a least-common-denominator sum—it ought to be nothing less than a grand addition.

But if we are thinking of present need, we cannot stop with the Younger Churches. How happy a fact it is that in China, for example, 61 per cent of non-Roman Christians are linked together in the National Christian Council. We have nothing to compare with that in our own land. They have comity instead of our competition, co-operation instead of our isolation; moreover, it is on the mission field that schemes of re-union are taken seriously.

There, without realizing it, I was quoting their resolution again:

> 'We appeal with all the fervour we possess . . . to the responsible authorities of the Older Churches to take this matter seriously to heart.'

[1] More thoroughly *scriptural* than anything which has taken its place.

That, I submit, with most churches here at home, has not begun to happen. How far has *Outline of a Re-union Scheme* affected denominational legislation? Are plans and policies one whit the less self-centred and self-regarding?

War came upon us in 1939, because from 1931 onwards (Japan's invasion of Manchuria), the nations failed to put collective security before individual interest. Are the churches in this regard any better than the nations?

For years there has been some talk of a United States of Europe. At first it moved only a minority of cranks. Then Federal Union became a catch-word—and the title of a Penguin! Still it belonged to theoretical idealists. Then came disaster. Without any preamble we heard one night, as though it were an announcement about pool petrol, that we had offered the French to pool the Empire's resources and make a common citizenship. I am told that Bishop Gore once said of the Church's divisions that he did not know what would heal them 'unless very evil times force us together.' Behold the times!

Who is not impatient in these days with all partial memberships and partial ministries, all barriers to sacraments and to service? Who does not want to see the ministrations of all the churches at the disposal of everybody's need? If I were a chaplain, I should hate to pick out three from a company as 'mine.' Chaplains do not—at least not on active service, not in the front line. The fact is our churches are trying to carry on their separate denominational lives at a time when no one knows where the front line may be to-morrow: it may be your own front street.

That to which we belong is the Church beyond the churches. When shall we hear the call, matching the need of the hour, to translate that consciousness of unity into worthier expression, 'that the world may believe'?

Who was the Servant of the Lord in Isaiah liii.?

(Continued.)

By the Reverend Professor Christopher R. North, M.A., Handsworth College, Birmingham.

To return to the point at which we left off our examination of the corporate personality theory. There are several difficulties in the collective theory besides the two which are recognized by Wheeler Robinson and Eissfeldt. They are:

(1) The Servant in the Songs is anonymous. ('Israel' in 49^3 is recognized to be a gloss even by many collectivists, including Wheeler Robinson.) Outside the Songs—except in five passages (42^{19} 43^{10} 44^{26} 49^7 50^{10}) which are either secondary or where the reading is doubtful—he is always equated with Jacob-Israel. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that this difference is intentional.

(2) The anonymity of the Servant in the Songs is accompanied by a heightened individualization in the portrait of the Servant. Mowinckel has remarked that the Servant in the Songs is clearly described as an individual; outside the Songs there is no real, but only a 'rhetorical' personification. There is, he says, a striking difference between the strongly individual stamp of the Servant in the Songs, and the 'colourless, unindividual, clearly collective' entity elsewhere. Zillessen, a collectivist, remarked, in 1904,[1] that in the Israel-Jacob passages we can hardly speak of personification, but only of a rapidly changing series of figures. In them the term Servant is nothing but a pure name, one of many predicates of Israel. For example, 'Thou, Israel, my Servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend; thou whom I have taken hold of from the ends of the earth, and called thee from the corners thereof, and said unto thee, Thou art my Servant' (Is $41^{8f.}$). It is not, therefore, sufficient to quote parallels to the individualized conception in the Songs. What we have to account for is the heightened individualism of the Songs, accompanied as it is by anonymity, as contrasted with the Servant Israel of the rest of the prophecy.

(3) The Servant of the Songs has an active mission, first to Israel, and then to the heathen. Outside the Songs the Servant Israel is the passive recipient of salvation, with no more active mission than to be Yahweh's witness in his judicial process against the idol-gods, a process in which his sole Godhead really needs no demonstration, but is manifest to all from what he has done for Israel. Coupled with this the attitude to the heathen in the Songs is more catholic and sympathetic than it is in the rest of the prophecy.

(4) Lastly, according to the collective theory all the disappointments, the uncomeliness, the sufferings, pains, and death of the Servant are so many allegorical representations of the Exile. There is no real progress from the situation depicted in one Song to that depicted in the next. Instead of a drama moving steadily to a climax we have a series of tableaux all representing the same situation.

We must now attempt to formulate constructive suggestions. An examination of the Songs in relation to their context has convinced me that the author of them was Deutero-Isaiah himself. The grounds for this can, of course, only be given in print or in the classroom. But briefly, the situation is this: the literary affinities of the first three Songs (42^{1-4} 49^{1-6} 50^{4-9}) compel, as clearly as such things can, the conclusion that Deutero-Isaiah was their author. No case against this is, or can be, made out on linguistic, but only on ideological grounds, of the kind already indicated. The Deutero-Isaianic authorship of the last Song is not so obvious; but so far as the evidence goes it is more consistent with Deutero-Isaiah's authorship than it is with authorship by any one else. I do not think a case has been made out, either by Elliger, or by Volz—who would date Is 53 in the fourth or third century B.C.—for the theory that the last Song is by a different author from the other three. If that were so, the third Song, with its expectation of approaching crisis—'Near is he that justifieth me; who will take proceedings against me?'—would leave us altogether in the air. We expect a sequel, and a speedy one. We have it in the last Song.

If, then, the Songs are by Deutero-Isaiah, and since Deutero-Isaiah elsewhere in the prophecy regularly calls Israel the Servant of Yahweh, it is clear that we must take as our starting point the equation the Servant=Israel. But in view of the anonymity of the Servant in the Songs, the heightened individualism, the mission of the Servant to Israel and to the Gentiles, together with

[1] A. Zillessen, 'Israel in Darstellung und Beurteilung Deuterojesajas' (*Z.A.W.*, 1904).

other ideological differences, it would seem as if we must narrow down the definition of the Servant, as indeed most collectivists have been obliged to do. The higher the task of the Servant becomes, the less is any community capable of fulfilling it. There is expansion and contraction, as the corporate personality theory urges. But I do not think the case is fully met by the suggestion that the effective Servant is the unselfconscious and undifferentiated Prophet himself. There is, of course, an element of truth in the autobiographical theory. Very much as Elgar in the 'Enigma Variations' set out to picture his friends, and inevitably gave us a portrait of himself, so did the Deutero-Isaiah unconsciously put himself into his picture of the Servant. Even supposing that the Prophet, when he began to sketch the figure of the Servant, was unconscious of any contrast between him and the nation as a whole, by the time he had completed the picture it must have come to life under his hand, even as Pygmalion's statue did. I think Professor Rowley is right when he says[1]: 'I believe the writer himself would have found difficulty in defining with precision what was in his own mind.' To that we may add, in the words of the Second Epistle of Peter: 'No prophecy ever came by the will of man: but men spake from God, being borne along by the Holy Spirit.' Dr. Rowley numbers himself among the collectivists, and in intention he seems to follow Dr. Wheeler Robinson. But he goes on to say: 'In general, I believe the author was personifying Israel, but in the fourth poem that personification is carried to a point where it is hard to escape the feeling that he really thought of an individual, so supremely the Servant of Yahweh that within the Servant community He stood out as its representative and leader, carrying its mission of service to a point no other could reach.' Presumably the individual so thought of had not yet appeared, but was still to come. Is, then, the interpretation collective, or are we not back once more at what is essentially the Messianic interpretation?

Objections are obvious, and may be anticipated. They are:

(1) The character and fortunes of the Servant are so vividly and convincingly drawn that we can only think of a portrait from life. On that principle we should have to say that every convincing character in drama or in fiction is a photographic reproduction from actual life. On the human side this is the work of a creative artist, and any artist is an artist in proportion as he can make his Hamlet convincingly real. Even so, there are features in the portrait of the Servant that transcend the bounds of any single human life. That is the strength of the collective interpretation. For example, How did the Servant die? Of sickness, or as a malefactor? It is as though the Prophet heaped upon him every conceivable misfortune. Dr. Theodore Robinson,[2] indeed, thinks that 'no one individual sat for the ideal portrait, but that the writer draws on the experiences of at least two different men.'

(2) There is the vexed question of the 'tenses.' Rudolph says that if the Messianic interpretation were right the tenses would have been either all future, or else all past, whereas some of them are past and some future. But even if the Hebrew perfect and imperfect corresponded exactly to our past and future—which they do not—there is no need to make such a bogey of them as we sometimes do in this connexion. In the last Song the fate of the Servant is described, mainly though not entirely, in past tenses. That fate is set within the framework of Yahweh's declaration concerning his future exaltation. It is in relation to the future that the death of the Servant is past, not in relation to the present of the writer.

(3) Finally, it is argued that since the Prophet expected the Servant to restore Israel, and since he expected the restoration of Israel to be accomplished soon, there was no time for the Servant to be born and grow to manhood. Therefore he must be 'already there.' It is this, of course, that has prompted the persistent attempts to discover some historical individual. Yet as often as some known individual has been proposed he has had to be withdrawn, until we are left with some vague anonymous like Rudolph's, or the equally untenable autobiographical theory. Is there no way out of the impasse? I suggest that there is, along these lines. The Songs are quite evidently born of an intense anguish of soul, the kind of anguish the Prophet must have experienced when Cyrus, whom he expected to be a kind of first-fruits of Yahwism among the Gentiles, proclaimed instead his enthusiasm for the gods of Babylon. This point has been made by Eissfeldt, Hempel, and others. It is clear, in any case, that the high expectations of the Prophet were only very partially realized. The fall of Babylon did not usher in the Golden Age, but an age of disillusionment and hopes deferred. The Prophet must have longed intensely for the salvation of his people, and neither

[1] *Israel's Mission to the World* (1939).

[2] Oesterley and Robinson, *Hebrew Religion: its Origin and Development*,[2] 345 f.

he nor any other Old Testament prophet was capable of thinking of that salvation apart from some measure of political restoration. Any prophet, in the century or two after the fall of Babylon, might have written of the raising up of the tribes of Jacob. There is much to be said for regarding the Songs as the last utterances of the Prophet. One of the reasons that led Duhm to deny them to Deutero-Isaiah was their quiet tone as compared with the rest of the prophecy. There is, indeed, a perceptible difference, similar to that between the vigorous and often tumultuous verse of Shakespeare's middle period, and the 'Our revels now are ended' of *The Tempest*. I do not think that is merely a subjective impression. If, then, as is probable, the Songs are later than the fall of Babylon, there may not be the same immediacy about the coming of the Servant as there had been about the triumphal march through the desert which the Prophet had so glowingly pictured in the days of his earlier, more buoyant enthusiasm. I am inclined to think that therein lies the explanation. However that may be, it is a constant feature of the prophetic vision that it is always foreshortened, and we have no right to demand that a seer of the sixth century B.C. should be as entirely logical as his modern interpreters aspire to be. If he had been, this problem would never have vexed the centuries as it has done. Whatever explanations we may offer, something will be left over for which our reason cannot fully account, and I feel that along the lines suggested in this paper that residuum is reduced to a minimum.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

In the Black-out.

By the Reverend S. Greer, M.A., Ayr.

'I will give thee the treasures of darkness.'—Is 45^{3}.

One of these nights when it is dark, but not too dark, you go out in the black-out streets. Everything is quite different from what it is by daylight. To see your town by moonlight or starlight is to see much that is lovely which you hadn't noticed before. The church steeple rises grandly against the stars. There is the Great Bear festooned about that ancient tower. Shabby old buildings make lovely pictures with their deep shadows; the gables of houses stand out clear against the faint light of the star-strewn sky. All that beauty is one of the 'treasures of darkness.' The glaring street-lamps had kept us from seeing them. The electric light had put out the stars.

There are a lot of things you see better in the dark. The driver of a bus shuts off all the lights behind him when he is driving at night. He could not see the way to go if it were not dark all around him. When in war time we have no longer the comfort and cheer we used to know, many things stand out far more clearly. Who could ever have guessed what courage there was in our people? Airmen who have won the V.C. were in peace times working in a shop or driving a van; others of our heroes were in offices or factories. Who would have dreamed there was such a splendid spirit in the folk of our big cities? Or think of the daring of our seamen, and the wonderful pluck of our girls and boys who keep their chin up and say, 'I'm not the one to cry.' You read of nurses who think not at all of their own safety if only they get their patients right, and the cheerful, friendly folk of the shelters doing all they can to help one another. Would you have thought there were such golden qualities in the hearts of plain folk? Their courage and self-sacrifice gleam out 'treasures of the darkness,' in the black night of war.

Something else the war has helped us to see, and that is how much we all owe to other people. You know how it is. We take one another for granted, and sometimes forget to say 'Thank you.' We never bother to ask who it is does things for us: who darns our stockings, and mends our clothes, and cooks our meals. Think sometimes of all that lies behind the things on our table. In what ships, convoyed through death-strewn waters, with hovering planes watching over them, was our

food brought to our shores? Remember sometimes the homes of the men who bring our cargoes, and all the romance and peril and anxiety that lie behind such plain things as a cup of tea. In the darkness God is showing us how much we need one another. This also is one of the 'treasures of darkness.'

Sometimes trouble comes to people, and they are very sad. Then you will hear them say, 'I never knew there were so many kind folk.' There's a whole lot of friendliness you never discover until trouble comes. It is only when happy days have gone for a time, and the lamps are all turned down, you see the great star of kindly sympathy.

I think God wants us to learn these things, so He does with us what we do with a bird when we wish to teach it to whistle. We cover its cage with a black cloth, whistle over the tune, and as it listens in the dark it learns its song.

And something else God wishes to teach us: how very much we need Him. One night when you're walking home in the black-out with Dad, you, who are so proud of being grown-up that you would never think of taking anybody's hand, are quite glad to have him beside you, and he may feel a wee hot hand slip into his, and he gives it a squeeze, for he quite understands. It is such a comfort to have him near. So in this worrying time your Father in Heaven wants you to trust Him and know He is looking after you. Just put your hand in His, and feel He is near. And that is the very best of all the 'treasures of darkness.'

The Thimble and the Nutmeg-Grater.

By the Reverend Peter Lovie, M.A., S.T.M., Coatbridge.

'And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.'—Mt 6^{12}.

Perhaps you have read some of Charles Dickens's books, like *David Copperfield* or *The Pickwick Papers*. In one of his not so well-known stories, Dickens tells about a servant-girl called Clemency Newcome. Clemency is questioned by a lawyer, Mr. Snitchey. Says Mr. Snitchey in a very important tone of voice, 'Can you read?' You must remember that in the days when Charles Dickens wrote his books not everybody could read. So Clemency was quite proud to be able to say that she could read a little. And then she added (never mind her grammar), 'I only reads a thimble.' Mr. Snitchey thought Clemency must be not all there, as you would, too, if some one said to you he could just read a thimble. But Clemency surprised Mr. Snitchey still further by nodding her head and saying she could also read a nutmeg-grater. Clemency was not so stupid as she seemed. You see, the thimble and the nutmeg-grater in the kitchen where she worked had both a motto carved on them, and she was in the habit of reading these mottoes every morning and every evening. In fact, as Dickens put it, the thimble and the nutmeg-grater were the pocket library of Clemency Newcome! Having got thus far, Mr. Snitchey did not stop with his questions. He asked Clemency what the thimble said. You may be sure that Clemency was very willing to show her knowledge. She replied very slowly, one syllable at a time: 'The thimble says, "For—get and for—give".' Mr. Snitchey laughed, but he wanted to know also what the nutmeg-grater said. Clemency answered again as if she were reading the inscription bit by bit, 'The grater says, "Do as you—would—be—done by".'

Now, while you may smile at Clemency Newcome, you must at least admit that the mottoes on the thimble and the nutmeg-grater *were* worth reading twice a day. Has it ever occurred to you that what you read is quite as important as how much you read? You might spend long hours reading, and at the end have no more to show for it than what Clemency Newcome had for what she read.

Is there not enough in these two mottoes on Clemency's thimble and nutmeg-grater to make even the cleverest of us think? 'Forget and forgive'—how many of us do really forgive those who have done us wrong? We may forget the injury for a time, but forgiveness is more than we can bring ourselves to. 'Do as you would be done by'—do we really treat others as we think they should treat us? We would need to show much less temper and much less selfishness if that were to be so.

A thimble and a nutmeg-grater don't usually go together as a pair, but the mottoes which Clemency Newcome found on her thimble and her nutmeg-grater do go together. You can't do to others as you would like them to do to you if you're not also forgetting and forgiving. And there is no true forgiveness which does not mean also kindness and patience and friendliness. Besides, what right have you to expect God to forgive you for your sins if you are not ready to forgive those who have wronged you? Which perhaps will explain to you that great sentence of the Lord's Prayer which we often repeat but so seldom understand: 'And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.'

The Christian Year.

Third Sunday in Lent.

The Supreme Motive.

'Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus.'—Ph 2^5.

The passage from which these words are taken deals with that self-emptying of the divine Son which was essential in order that the Incarnate life should be truly lived, with the humiliation of the Cross, and the final, and consequent, exaltation of the Saviour to the state where His Name is above every name.

If you look at the words in their full context, you will see that *this gigantic motive is brought to bear in order to commend a very simple, very elementary duty*. Was it worth while to use so large a lever to move so small a weight? The question hides a fallacy. In the first place, it is not really a small weight. Any one who supposes that it does not matter much whether a little community of Christians at Philippi were or were not at peace together, and considerate of one another, has a mistaken scale of values. No doubt the hearers of the Sermon on the Mount were startled by the combining of a downright breach of the Commandments, and a secret thought of the heart in one general warning, but a disease-germ is not less deadly because it is very small. In fact, if it were larger, we could perhaps see it coming, and defend ourselves against it. The conquest of nature by grace in the interests of goodness is always a very important and often a very difficult thing. It may be that the human faith which releases the energy or grace is very small, like a grain of mustard-seed, but the energy is that of God, and it will all be needed.

In the next place, *the grace of God is not tied to the alternative of being available only on the large scale or only on the small scale*. In human things this is probably essential. The commander-in-chief and the lance-corporal have their own provinces in which they operate efficiently. Neither could well discharge the function of the other. There are callings in which the distinction does not vanish, but lessens. There is a difference between the work of priest and prophet; but the two functions can be combined in one person to the advantage of both. So, too, the father has his domestic duty and his outside life; but he is the same man, and his character tells, for good or ill, in both alike. The grace of God is not wholesale only, or retail only. It is like the controlled strength, of which we can see an example in the gigantic hammer of a well-wrought machine, which can crush a ton of quartz, or descend so gently that it will leave an egg-shell barely cracked.

There is just one warning. It is not necessary always to put into words what is being done. Good people have sometimes in the past grown into the habit of using Bible language or the language of piety so much that it has first wearied and then disgusted hearers. Cromwell wrote military dispatches in the language of the Book of Joshua, and he meant every word of it. Carlyle says: 'The reader will be wise to believe that these Puritans do mean what they say, and to try unimpeded if he can discover what that is. Gradually a very stupendous phenomenon will rise on his astonished eyes, a practical world based on belief in God.' That is quite true, but the trouble was that others followed, not meaning it so much, and there crept in a suspicion of insincerity. The great motive must *never* be *unfairly* used.

Apart from that—and it is our own infirmity more than a real danger lest the language itself should ever be outworn—apart from that, God, it would seem, does not shrink from applying the supreme motive, or allowing it to be applied. Thus, we conceive it to be right that every prayer of ours should end with 'through Jesus Christ our Lord.' There, in the simple petition, for example, that our darkness may be lightened, and that we may be defended from 'perils and dangers of the night,' is the supreme motive brought to bear. 'Through Jesus Christ' means 'through the Crucified.' We hold up in devout imagination before the loving all-knowledge of the Father the remembrance of that ultimate humiliation, the torn body and the broken heart of a condemned Prisoner, who once, in nakedness, all stained with dust and blood, paid the last penalty of life upon the gallows.

> And now, O Father, mindful of the love
> That bought us, once for all, on Calvary's Tree,
> . . . . . .
> We here present, we here spread forth to Thee
> That only offering perfect in Thine eyes,
> The one true, pure, immortal sacrifice.
> . . . . . .
> For lo! between our sins and their reward
> We set the passion of Thy Son our Lord.

It is a useful exercise to put yourself in the position of one to whom it is all new. Then you will see how tremendous, how 'unbelievable' it is. Think first of the assertion that in our Lord we have Very God

of Very God. With singular power of imagination Browning, in the poem called 'An Epistle,' recaptures the interested incredulity with which an inquiring, cultured person of the first century may be supposed to have met Lazarus of Bethany, and talked with him of the Nazarene physician, 'the learned leech,' who some years before had wrought so marvellous a cure. The inquirer writes, apologetically, to his friend:

> This man so cured regards the curer, then,
> As—God forgive me! who but God himself.

He breaks off to mention something of real importance, a botanical discovery that he has made on the margin of a pool, and then returns again to the queer, impossible, but curiously interesting fancy of this strange, silent man of Bethany. There is here no hint of Cross or Atonement. The poet's art is concerned, not to preach a complete Christian sermon, but to imagine a historical situation. Add something of even greater moment to the doctrine which pierced the sympathy and vexed the reason of the learned Arab; suppose that it can be believed that the Creator and sustainer of the world did tabernacle in this world of His creation. Then add to it the further and even more impossible conclusion that the Divine Being, thus incarnate, gave Himself to death, tasted, Himself pure and spotless, the misery of the forsaken, the despair of the desperate, even the godlessness of the ungodly. Oh, it is past all belief—and yet, even in human things it is the fact that love and heroism together do just this, achieve the impossible.

We have no power to explain it. The deep level where the Lord goes in His passion is one where we have no key or right to go. It is the spiritual power-house of the world, where values are created, where is shaped the real history of mankind. We can only suggest that, when the fullness of the time was come, when the age-long conflict of good and evil was sharpened to a single point, *then* it seemed worth while to the Creator to bring to bear His ultimate motive. And what is that? It is a motive of which the sole merit, the sole strength, is that it is pure, unlimited, unmitigated love. It is love and nothing else. It is love going all the way. When Satan waxes bold and swaggers up to the very central citadel of God's creation, to precipitate this one decisive battle of the world, the Lord God Almighty takes the challenge, and flings His glove into the empty space between the hosts. And the Hand of which the glove is symbol is a Pierced Hand.[1]

[1] S. C. Carpenter, *The House of Pilgrimage*, 35.

Fourth Sunday in Lent.

The Parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin, and the Prodigal Son.

By the Reverend A. D. Harcus, M.A., Ealing, London.

'There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.'—Lk 15^{10}.

In these stories our Lord throws His net wide. What man of you, having an hundred sheep, if he lose one; what woman, having ten coins, if she lose one; what boy, leaving home, finding himself lost in the far country! And the effect of the thrice-repeated message is cumulative, like a chord struck again and again, differing each time slightly and yet so distinctively in the texture of its harmony, bringing the message home to the heart. And the message concerns two central ideas, *being lost and being found*. The first applies to man and the second is the concern of God.

There are differences in the ways of being lost. The sheep wandering away with no deliberate intention; perhaps an unusually luscious morsel of grass tempts it, and then another a little farther on, until all of a sudden it is lost. The misplaced coin—here is human responsibility at its least; put in the wrong place, forgotten, in some little corner of life, out of sight and out of mind. The prodigal son is a different proposition; all the steps are deliberate, premeditated. 'Father, give me my portion,' and then, in a revealing phrase, he gathered all together. He went through the old home, and after he had finished there was not much left that could by any stretch of the imagination be called his. Little as we like the older brother's attitude afterwards, there is something to be said for his bitterness. In the third story human responsibility is at its greatest. All was of a man's deliberate free will.

Being found—here the stories are the same, they tell of prolonged, careful, anxious search. The shepherd's quest leads him far out across the hills, and

> None of the ransomed ever knew
> How deep were the waters crossed.

In the narrative of the great winter storm in *Lorna Doone* Jan Ridd tells how he brought home the sheep, one under each arm, sixty-six he brought across the moor safe to the upper sheppey. A memory of student days brings to mind a shepherd's cottage near the foot of the Grey Mare's Tail. We had walked all day past Loch Skene through as desolate a country as can be found in Scotland

(desolate and yet how hauntingly beautiful), and at the end of the day, tired out, we sought tea and a rest in the cottage. And by the side of the fire, the centre of the children's care, in a basket was a little lamb. The shepherd had found it injured in his walk in the early morning on those same high moors that took us the whole day to climb and cross, and brought it home. What stories of shepherds will be found in the Book of Remembrance!

The housewife is search personified. One coin out of ten represented a loss that simply could not be endured, and so every nook and cranny was subjected to a relentless inquisition. Gone is the romance of the shepherd and the hillside and the loch, instead a wearisome, somewhat grimy business of turning out room and cupboard. It might be called intensive rather than extensive, the kind of search that is never recorded!

The father—you say here is a difference, no searching now, the boy finds his own way home. And yet the parable uses the same word, found, significantly modified in the form, was lost and is found. (Compare the decisive 'I have found' of the shepherd and housewife.) Even so the boy is spoken of as being found. Shall we call it the spiritual search? 'Whither shall I flee from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I make my bed in Sheol, behold thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me.' Or quote Kipling's lines:

> If I were drowned in the deepest sea,
> I know whose tears would come down to me,
> Mother o' mine.

The spiritual search—there is a difference one must admit, a difference between searching for the lost sheep and for the prodigal in the far country. The element of free will has to be allowed for both in the going away and in the coming back. In a sense, as he went so he must return, but to make the father passive in the whole matter is to be untrue to the best of human nature. Every thought and prayer, day and night, was of and for his boy. The magnet of the father's love drew the wanderer home.

Can you believe that these little simple pictures of life are a revealing of the character of God, revelation in its clearest form? One might discuss doctrine but picture language conveys a direct message. It is revelation in its purest form; the written word melts into the living word and we forget the actual story and come face to face with the Good Shepherd who gave his life for the sheep; and, reading of the prodigal's welcome home, we say 'Our Father who art in heaven' with a new intensity of faith. The three parables speak a direct simple word to us, they reveal God. They reveal that God the Father can suffer loss, has a sense of loss. Revelation is needed for this or else it could not be believed. Common sense helps one to believe in a creator, but that same common sense would further say that the very immensity and complexity of the universe completely rebuts any faith in our own value. Surely one mortal more or less can be of no account in the mind of God! God *has* a sense of loss, whether it be one in a hundred, or one in ten or one out of two, and the result is an intensive search for that which is lost. And the parables speak of joy. In some ways these phrases, 'joy shall be in heaven' and 'there is joy in the presence of the angels of God' remain among the most intimate in the Gospels. They take us away from the idea of the size of the universe, of the vastness of space and bring us into the atmosphere of home.

The three stories are for you, yourself. This sense of loss, the unremitting search and the resulting joy concern you. Disregard the ninety and nine, that is pure irony; they do not and never did exist. 'We have all sinned and fallen short of the glory of God.' If you are confident of your place in life, a clear road before you and a sure destiny, then close the book and forget the stories, they can have no meaning for you. But if the word 'lost' fits you, lost—out of place in a corner and you feel quite rightly that it is not your fault, life put you there and forgot you; lost—on the hills, in the dark and yet you never really willed it, it was just the result of a number of careless, perhaps stupid, moves, but the fact remains you are where you are; lost—of your own deliberate folly and sin. And very often it is not one of these but something composed of all three that fits you, they are all present in your experience. And in some way you have got to find yourself—the prodigal came to himself before he started to come to his father; in some way you have got to be found, taken out of your corner where you have been hidden so long; in some way you have to be carried back, like a helpless lamb broken and maimed, on the strong shoulders of the shepherd. And in every way it is all of God the Father; He begins it in the stirring of heart and conscience and carries it through to its triumphal ending in the 'safe home, at last.'

How far away we are from any idea of the

Christian faith as being something conventional, reasonably in accord with the best thought of the day. Rather is it daring, nay presumptuous. It presumes your special place in the Father's home, in the Father's mind and heart. And if the place be empty, the chair vacant, then there is a concern, a searching prolonged and anxious and a bringing home and you find yourself safe in the Father's home, in His care and love and you hear the bells of heaven ringing for you. 'There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.'

PASSION SUNDAY.

The Passion not Passive.

'Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it.'—Col $2^{14.\ 15}$.

This is an aspect of the Cross which is often overlooked, namely, that whatever else it was, it was *victory, a manifestation of power*. In the Cross Christ is, according to the Apostle, blotting things out, nailing things down into impotence and ineffectiveness, making a show of, and triumphing over, principalities and powers. When we contemplate the crucifixion of the Master our tendency is to think of Him primarily as passive. Yet clearly the Apostle's words do not fit such a picture at all. They imply that He was active, resistant, on the offensive, not receiving blows but giving them, not having the floods go over Him but breasting them like a strong swimmer. We think of Him as being nailed to the Cross by cunning injustice and brutal force. No, says the Apostle in effect, that is not so, or rather it is only the outward appearance of things; get down to the underlying reality and behold it is Jesus who is doing the nailing all the time.

This New Testament apprehension of the note of vigorous activity and victory in the passion of Christ was apparently only gradually lost from the thought of the Church. Early pictorial representations of the Cross, we are told, all endeavoured to convey the impression of kingly triumph. It was in mediæval times that the Crucifix as we know it, giving unconsciously a wrong trend to our thoughts, became common—the Crucifix which shows a limp, pain-drenched, pathetic figure. Nor can there be any question which of the two representations is the more true to the facts. If we look at the gospel story of the Passion as a whole and do not isolate the Cross from its context, one of the most impressive and revealing things in it is the air of strong deliberation and mastery which characterizes Jesus throughout those last days. He is so manifestly not in the least a straw on the stream of events; He is controlling the stream of events. There is an atmosphere of mastery all about Him as He steadfastly sets His face towards Jerusalem. Standing before the council, or before Pilate, there is no suggestion of fumbling or hesitancy. Nor, on the other hand, is there any suggestion of a merely excited and fanatical confidence. It is the other people who are excited, not He. And it is always the excited people who are the weak people. He says almost regally, 'No man taketh my life from me; I lay it down of myself.'

The same masterful attitude of mind is revealed in His refusal to take the drug which was offered to Him. That surely gives us a glimpse of the innermost places of His mind. He has no intention of being carried through this thing on an anæsthetic. And we may be thankful that He did refuse. Had we to believe that His spirit was clouded by a drug, the Cross would lose something of its power to reveal the very heart of God, for there is no drug, no anodyne, for God in respect of the burden sin lays upon Him. And yet we may be thankful that the drug was offered even if it was refused. The refusal shows that we are not reading significances into the Cross, but that Christ was deliberately and consciously intending significance to be read. The Passion is not passive; there is in it an active purpose which has no intention of losing at any point its grip of the situation.

What then of the cry of dereliction?—'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' Where is the note of victory in that? One hesitates to speak of this so solemn and tragic moment, yet the more one ponders it, the more one feels that that cry, so far from minimizing the impression of active power and victory, contributes to it. For it gives us a measure of the frightful force of the challenge which met Him, and therefore also of the spiritual power in Him which overcame it. For surely those are right who see infinite significance in the fact that the cry was still to '*My* God.' God was still the great overshadowing Reality, the great Reality moreover from whom He would permit no other reality, however momentarily overwhelming, to separate Him. This cry was surely not one of defeat, but was rather the deepest activity of faith thrusting through the final darkness to God.

Has this anything to say to us? Much in every way, for whatever is shown to us in the Cross must

lie at the very centre of the life of faith. We choose two things.

First, it makes a very great difference indeed to the whole temper and tone of the spiritual life to have at the heart of it the awareness, continually renewed, of *God as active Holy Will dealing with us*—of holy purpose seeking us before ever we seek Him, knocking at our door, searching our being, challenging the will with His will. And this can be best tested and verified precisely in relation to the Cross. How great the difference between contemplating the Cross of our Lord, being a spectator of it, even though it be a very earnest spectator anxious to learn from it, and apprehending in it the activity of His mighty spirit of holiness and love towards mankind and therefore towards *you*. Apprehending that, you cease to be a spectator and become involved in a tremendous and most critical personal relationship. From being a merely solemnizing and subduing spectacle it becomes a crisis, an inescapable challenge from the Christ to *you*. You see, as the New Testament sees, not a victim but One who in the midst of crucifixion is King, the Wisdom and the Power of God.

The second thing is this. We are to think, not only of the activity of the Crucified towards us, but also of *His activity through us towards all mankind*. We are to think, that is to say, of His Church, the Fellowship of His people, for all its weakness and imperfection, as part of His masterful and victorious assault, culminating in Calvary, upon the evil of the world. According to the New Testament, the Kingdom of God, by which is meant the victorious rule of God, broke into human history in an entirely new and decisive way in the advent of Christ; it established itself, through His life and supremely through His Cross; and it is still working, undefeated and undefeatable in the midst of all the chaos of human life, towards some final and as yet unimaginable consummation.

No doubt this is a very high view of the Church. No doubt it strikes us at first as almost wildly discordant with the facts of the Church's life as we know it. Yet there is no denying that in these days any other view of the Church, any other faith than one which is thus able to rest quietly on the confidence that the victory is with the Crucified is not adequate to the facts. In this modern world of vast and uncontrollable forces sweeping like a great tide through the seas of human history we must above all else recover the sense of the Church's cosmic significance and dimension, and, on the same cosmic scale, of the certain victory of the Christ who called it into being. It does not suffice any longer, if it ever sufficed, merely to think of Christ as winning the victory in *my* life, as having loved *me*, though it is always quite indispensable to be able so to think; it is indispensable, but not sufficient. We must think also of His overcoming of the world and of His love to the world. 'God so loved the *world*.'

To think thus of the Church which we know is to make upon it a judgment of faith—that power to see through the appearances to the deeper underlying realities, the realities which nothing can finally shake or defeat, and this deeper vision is given us, I know not how, by Christ and above all by those tremendous last days of His life. In the presence of Calvary we are confronted by an inescapable alternative: either this was defeat, defeat final and absolute, or it was victory. And the answer rises unbidden from the depths of the soul, given by that Spirit which it was promised should take of the things of Christ and show them unto us—this was, this is, this will be victory. This Man is Master.[1]

PALM SUNDAY.

The Mystery of the Crying Stones.

BY THE REVEREND T. TUDOR RHYS, B.A., B.D., HINCKLEY.

'And he answered and said unto them, I tell you that, if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out.'—Lk 19^{40}.

Dr. Owen Davies of Caernarvon was once asked by a young student: 'What type of preacher would you consider to be the most necessary to-day?' 'Every type,' he replied. But here is the strangest: 'the stones would immediately cry out.' To what kind of sermons will these preaching stones give utterance—if the occasion ever arises?

When we read the story of the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem I wonder whether we feel the sheer pity of it all. It is, in one sense, the story of frustration and failure. There is no need to re-tell the tale. It is enough to admit that, at the last, Jesus met with almost universal rejection. Almost. A few still remained who clung to Him. Some children did. A few did who remembered how kind He had been and how compassionate. But what of the privileged—those who, because of their special knowledge and training ought to have welcomed His message, and because of their official position had power to help Him? It was they who

[1] H. H. Farmer, *The Healing Cross*, 169.

shouldered their way through the crowd that day and said to Him: 'Teacher, check your disciples.' And in answer He said: 'I tell you, if they were to keep quiet, the very stones would shout.' What is the message for to-day which lies within the mystery of these crying stones? There is, first of all, this:

That God is going to win—whatever happens.

'I tell you,' said Jesus, 'that if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out.' *If these . . .* By 'these' Jesus had in mind all the friends who were left to Him on that day. Shall we press that 'if' as far as we dare and see whither it leads? If the time should ever come in human history when the love of God finds no response in human hearts, it will, nevertheless, find a response elsewhere in God's universe. If men should cease to answer, the stones will. To be sure, we have been brought up to believe that God will achieve His purpose through the willing co-operation of men and women. But what if we fail Him? What if the indifference of the many and the hostility of the few should ever become universal? What if, at some time, there should occur a general defection of God's human allies? What if, through some corporate act of folly and sin, human civilization should collapse? Will that mean the defeat of God? Oh no! If we fail, He will not. 'If these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out.' What other allies, of what other order, there may lie hidden behind the veil of this mystery, I cannot tell. But the suggestion is that they are there, biding their time—if ever they should be needed.

Now, that is most humbling to our pride. But there it is. God is indispensable to us. But are we indispensable to Him? Is it possible that we have been self-deluded into a sense of our own importance? We have grown accustomed to the thought that we are at the centre of the spiritual universe, and that human personality is the only thing in it that counts.

> Tho' world on world in myriad myriads roll
> Round us, each with different powers,
> And other forms of life than ours,
> What know we greater than the soul?

All that, no doubt, is very comforting. But the fact is that we do not know. The Professor is right. This is a Mysterious Universe. The external world, say some Idealists, may be the creation of human thought. If there were no human eyes to look, there would be nothing to see; if no human mind to perceive, there would be nothing there. That is all very flattering, no doubt. But Emily Brontë has an equal right to be heard:

> Though earth and man were gone,
> And suns and universes ceased to be,
> And Thou were left alone,
> Every existence would exist in Thee.

If man's allegiance were to cease, if human help were withdrawn, there would still be witnesses innumerable elsewhere in God's mysterious universe to His wisdom, His power, and His love. That is what Jesus seems to be saying. 'If these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out.' It may be that we need that cold douche of realism.

The great liner was on her way to be scrapped. Some workmen who had helped to build her were taken on board for a last tour of inspection. The farewell was pathetic. 'It was I,' said one of them, 'who fixed those rivets.' 'It took me three months,' said another, 'to finish that job.' But God's ship is not going to be scrapped. Whether we are on board with Him or not, He continues the voyage. Either with or without us, God will win. If we fail, it is not God who fails. We need to hear that iron note once more.

> It fortifies my soul to know
> That, though I perish, Truth is so,
> That, howsoe'er I stray and range,
> Whate'er I do, Thou dost not change.
> I steadier step when I recall
> That, if I slip, Thou dost not fall.

Our very surroundings may rise up in judgment against us.

'If these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out.' The stones? That is Nature. We sometimes say, in self-defence, that Nature does not give us a fair chance. There is a doctrine which says that the natural world is here to hinder our spiritual growth, that, but for our natural environment, we should live in unbroken communion with God. It has even been said that this world is so impregnated with evil that God could not have had anything to do with the making of it. There is no trace of that view in the New Testament. Indeed, in the Fourth Gospel there is the startling declaration that when God sent His Son into the world He revealed the principle upon which He made, and governs, the whole universe. The power that gave us Christ is the power that made the world. 'All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.' No. Nature is not here to hinder us but

to help us, and if we do not respond to the love and providence of God, visible all around us in the natural world, then Nature herself is our accuser and our judge.

Stones? Those are our circumstances. There are some who say that circumstances never gave them a chance of seeing the Lord, of hearing His voice or serving His cause. There often is a bitter truth in that indictment. But is there ever the whole truth? I once read this story about one of the men of the New Testament. He was small of stature and he lived in Jericho. By this time he was an old man. Every day he could be seen tending the ground with loving care round about an old sycamore tree. One day some one stopped and spoke to him. 'Sir,' he said, 'why do you lavish so much care and love upon that old sycamore tree?' And then the old man told him his story. 'One day, many years ago,' he said, 'I heard the news that Jesus of Nazareth was passing by. But at that time I was very unpopular, and, being on the short side, I couldn't see for the crowd. My circumstances were against me. But,' he said, 'there was this tree. It was from the branches of this tree that I first caught a glimpse of what Jesus was like.' It was his one chance, but he took it. Suppose he had missed it? Maybe we have more chances than we think. And if we miss them, then our very opportunities will become our judges, and the very stones of our circumstances will cry out. Lastly, there is this:

The rebuke of the unexpected response.

Upon that first Palm Sunday who was it who really bore witness to the kingship of Christ? Was it Man? Was it the men of privilege and opportunity? 'And when he was come near, he beheld the city, and wept over it.' Or was it the common people? It is true that to-day they were shouting Him up: in a week they were shouting Him down. From the world of men the tribute was meagre and thin, and most of it came from the lips of little children.

From the world of men, let us turn to the world of Nature. It was the colt of an ass,

> The tattered outlaw of the earth
> Of ancient crooked will,

that bore the Master towards His kingdom. And the colt was there because the Lord had need of him. It was the palm leaves from the hedge-rows that made a path under those tired feet and eased the roughness of that way of sorrows. And (we have His own word for it), if the need had arisen, the stones would immediately have cried out. The ass, the palms, and the stones! They are not going to desert Him now. Christ gets glory from unexpected quarters. He finds friends among the unprivileged. But it is not for them that He is going to Jerusalem to die. Not for beasts, or flowers, or stones. But their share in His Triumphal Entry is a stinging rebuke to the ingratitude of human hearts. It is often the outsiders who are nearest to Him in the end.

What lies behind the mystery of these crying stones? Many a surprise. 'I tell you, if they were to keep quiet, the very stones would shout.' They are shouting now. But they are shouting so loudly that many of us cannot hear what they are saying. Perhaps we shall know some day. It may be something like this: 'For many that are first shall be last, and the last shall be first.'

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By the Reverend J. W. Jack, D.D., Glenfarg, Perthshire.

Dress and Apparel.—Though there are numerous words for these both in the original Hebrew (*'ēzōr, kuttōneth, simlah, me'īl, 'addereth,* etc.) and in our English Version of the Old Testament ('garments,' 'raiment,' 'attire,' 'coat,' etc.), our information as to the particular articles of dress worn by the Israelites is obscure and scanty. In other words, while the Hebrew vocabulary is abundant, its meaning is somewhat uncertain. The translation is assisted in some cases by the Hebrew etymology, but as a rule it has largely to be determined by the context. Under the circumstances we have to fall back for our principal source of information (not always trustworthy perhaps) on the monuments that contain figured representations of the Palestinian people. Unfortunately, there is almost an entire lack of such records in Palestine itself, but this deficiency is compensated by the ancient

paintings and reliefs found in Egypt and Assyria, which give us pictures of Canaanite, Hebrew, and other Palestinian prisoners or tribute-bearers. The Egyptian representations date mostly from the Second and Third Bronze Ages (*c.* 2000–1200 B.C.), while the Assyrian ones belong to the end of the Judæan and Israelite monarchies. We have practically no monuments giving us descriptions of dress at the time of Joshua's Conquest or during the post-Exilic period.

1. **Loin-cloth and Plaid.**—The oldest and most generally used article of dress was the simple loin-cloth (*'ēzōr*), often incorrectly translated 'girdle' in our English version (as in Job 12^{18}, Is 5^{27} 11^{5}, Ezk 23^{15}, etc.). It consisted of a strip of skin (cf. Elijah, 2 K 1^{8}; John the Baptist, Mt 3^{4}, Mk 1^{6}); or ordinary cloth (cf. Jer $13^{1ff.}$); or in cases of mourning, hair-cloth (E.V. 'sackcloth,' cf. Is 20^{2}). It was wrapped round the loins, reached down to the knees, and was fastened by a waist-belt. This article of apparel is well represented in the well-known mural painting taken from the tomb of Khnumhotep at Beni Hasan in the Nile Valley, a painting which describes the coming of thirty-seven Amorites (or possibly Hebrews), under a chief named Absha, in the sixth year of Senusret II. of the Twelfth Dynasty (*c.* 2000 B.C.), and is thought by some to refer to the arrival of Abraham and his retainers in Egypt (cf. Gn 12^{10}).[1] Here the loin-cloths of the Egyptians are of white linen, and somewhat bell-shaped like kilts, while those of the Palestinians are narrower but embroidered and ornamented in various colours, especially red, white, and blue. This portraiture is probably correct, for there is good evidence that the Hebrews (if they were such) were fond of colour. It is true, their language possessed no developed colour vocabulary—it had no distinct terms for different shades—but they were certainly not deficient in colour sense (as used to be contended by some scholars). The Song of Deborah gives proof of their liking for garish apparel. 'Have they not divided the spoil (taken from the Hebrews),' says the mother of Sisera, 'a spoil of divers colours for Sisera, divers colours of embroidery?' It is worthy of note perhaps that two small silver statuettes from Ras Shamra have loin-cloths made from gold leaf, and the Baal of Thunder discovered there has one adorned with horizontal stripes.

In the course of the centuries, particularly by the beginning of the Iron Age (*c.* 1200 B.C.), this simple article of dress tended to be worn exclusively by soldiers and manual workers. It was the only apparel of the Philistine warriors (who may be recognized by their diadem of feathers) as pictured on the second pylon of the temple erected by Ramesses III. at Medinet Habu near Thebes, and it was the main part of the military dress of the Israelites at the time of the monarchy, if we judge from the reliefs of Sennacherib representing the siege of Lachish (*c.* 700 B.C.). In the latter case it is seen to be the dress of the soldier pushing a pack-camel before him and of the other walking by the side of an ox-cart on which the fugitives have piled their belongings.

In the case of the better-class people, especially when not working, the loin-cloth was merely an under garment. Thus, in the Beni Hasan picture, the leader of the group as well as his immediate associates wear over it a sort of plaid (mostly of blue and red colour) fastened above one shoulder and leaving the other shoulder uncovered down to the armpit, while the women wear the same kind of garment though slightly longer.

2. **Tunic or Sleeved Garment.**—Among the Hebrews of all classes, both male and female, from about 1200 B.C. downward, the loin-cloth was largely displaced in every-day life by a sleeved under garment or tunic, reaching down to the ankle among the well-to-do or at least to the middle of the lower leg, and either embroidered in colour along the selvages and hems or simply fringed. The Hebrew name was *kuttōneth*, wrongly rendered 'coat' in our English Version (cf. Gn $37^{3.31}$, Ex 28^{39}, Lv 10^{5}, 2 S 15^{32}, Ezr 2^{69}, etc., cf. also Jn 19^{23} R.V.m). Though really an under garment like the loin-cloth, this tunic was the one in which the ordinary everyday work was done. It is the *kettōneth passîm* ('tunic reaching to palms and soles') of Joseph and of the royal princess Tamar, wrongly translated 'coat of many colours' (Gn 37^{3}, 2 S 13^{18}). The Jewish captives of Lachish, when making their submission with bare head and feet to Sennacherib, are pictured in such a garment, fitting close round the neck (cf. Job 30^{18}), while the scribe who presents himself before Bar-rekub of Sam'āl, on the Zenjirli stela, and the musicians of the Assyrian army, are similarly depicted.

3. **Outer Garments.**—In regard to outer garments, serving to protect the wearers, whether men or women, against cold weather, and to cover them during the night (cf. Ex $22^{26f.}$), several kinds are mentioned in the Old Testament. (1) The commonest was the *simlah* or *salmah* (cf. Gn 45^{22}, Dt 8^{4} 10^{18} 21^{13}, Jos 9^{5}, 1 K 11^{29}, Is 3^{6}, etc.), which consisted of a long rectangular piece of cloth (wool

[1] For the picture, see Newberry, *Beni Hasan*, i. pl. xxviii.

or linen), not 'put on' the body but wrapped round and round it like the *himation* of the Greeks which it closely resembled (as in Mt 5^{40} 24^{18}, Mk 13^{16}, etc.), and held together by a girdle at the waist. If the wrapping was not long enough to reach up to the shoulders it appears to have been supplemented sometimes by an independent cape. This Palestinian garment is well represented on the Egyptian monuments of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties. It is worn, for example, over the tunic by the Palestinian prisoners who are pictured on a relief from the tomb of Harmhab (*c.* 1358 B.C.), and by the besieged inhabitants of Ashkelon as represented on the reliefs of Ramesses II. (2) Another type, probably of Babylonian origin, was the *me'īl* usually translated 'robe' or 'mantle.' Properly speaking, it seems to have been a superior kind of shawl, ornamented with fringes, which was crossed over the shoulders and then wound round the tunic. It had a richer and more ornate appearance than the *simlah*, and was worn only by men of rank, such as Saul and Jonathan (1 S 18^4 24^5), the princes of the sea (Ezk 26^{16}), Samuel (1 S 15^{27}), Ezra (Ezr 9^3), David (1 Ch 15^{27}), High Priests (Ex 28^{31}, Lv 8^7), and others. It is shown on the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III. (*c.* 841 B.C.), where the Israelite nobles are represented bringing Jehu's tribute, and is found on bas-reliefs in Syria (Barrekub of Sam'āl is thus portrayed) and in Hittite lands, as well as on the mural paintings of the Assyrian palaces at Til Barsib (modern *Tell Aḥmar*) on the Euphrates. (3) There was still another kind of outer garment, *'addereth*, which was a wide cloak or mantle of hair, confined usually to the prophets (cf. Gn 25^{25}, 1 K 19^{13}, 2 K 2^8, Zec 13^4, also Jos 7^{21} 'fine mantle of Shinar').

Transjordan.

Not a Desert.—One cannot read the latest results of Professor Glueck's archæological activities on the east of the Jordan[1] without feeling that he has successfully disposed of several erroneous suppositions regarding this little known region (including Moab and Edom). One of these, still prevalent among many Biblical readers, is that it consists almost entirely of dry sterile desert or billowing sands, without vegetation or water, something like the Sahara. Most of it, certainly, is hard, sandy soil, brown and black, covered with minute fragments of glistening lava in infinite profusion (resulting from prehistoric volcanic action), but Dr. Glueck states that 'after the spring rains the grass springs up as if by magic,' followed by 'a carpet of green,' and that there are extensive pasture grounds (cf. Ps $65^{12.\ 13}$, Jl $1^{19.\ 20}$ 2^{22}, Jer 23^{10}, etc.). The usual Hebrew word for 'desert' (*midbār*) implies this, for it really means a tract to which herds are led for pasture (from *dābar* 'to lead or guide,' cf. *dōber* 'pasture,' Mic 2^{12} R.V., Is 5^{17} R.V.). It is not generally known, for example, that the slopes of Mt. Nebo and the plains stretching west towards the Dead Sea, as well as the regions east and south-east, are well cultivated in many parts, and the same is true of the lands of Moab and Edom. If the *wadi*-beds are dry, water can generally be found just beneath their surface. This is due to the fact that the water sinks down and is retained underground by the hard or rocky bottom, so that copious supplies can always be obtained by digging holes about two feet deep in the bed. The ancient inhabitants of Transjordan were familiar with this phenomenon, as the Bedouin are to this day, and hence built many of their dwelling-places on sites overlooking dry *wadi*-beds (cf. Jos $15^{61.\ 62}$). This peculiarity of the region explains the 'miracle' in 2 K $3^{16.\ 17}$, which seems to have taken place in the *Wadi* forming the dividing line between Moab and Edom, whose upper reaches are still called *Wadi el-Aḥsa* ('Valley of the Sandy Water-pits'): 'Thus saith the Lord, I will make this torrent bed full of cisterns (*gēbîm*). . . . Ye shall see neither wind nor rain, yet this torrent bed shall be filled with water.' The 'miracle,' so-called, may thus be regarded as a natural phenomenon, resting on accurate local knowledge.

Not Uncultured.—Another prevailing idea is that the inhabitants in these regions were backward, and less civilized than those on the west side of the Jordan. The fact, however, is that, although they may not have had prophets similar to those of Israel and Judah, they must have had outstanding leaders and also gifted writers who recorded historical events, though the works of the latter have not been handed down to us any more than the 'Book of Yashar' (Jos 10^{13}, 2 S 1^{18}). Important inscriptions, however, have been found, such as the famous Moabite stela of black granite at Dhiban (now in the Louvre), which may be dated *c.* 842 B.C., and which (apart from the finds at Ras Shamra) is the longest literary document in ancient 'Hebrew' outside the Bible, as well as the famous stela found at Baluah, belonging (it is believed) to the twelfth century B.C., and containing many lines of inscription now too weather-beaten to be decipherable. In most respects, indeed, the inhabitants east and west of the Jordan wrote and

[1] See especially his recent publication, *The Other Side of the Jordan* (New Haven, Conn.).

spoke the same 'Hebrew' language, were of the same racial stock, and no doubt developed similar cultures.

Not Unproductive.—The land, so far from being unprofitable and valueless, is rich in copper and iron deposits, particularly in the Wadi Arabah. These were exploited by the kings of Judah, and at Ezion-geber on the Red Sea an elaborate smelter or refinery was built by Solomon, where previously 'roasted' ores were worked up into ingots of purer metal. Long before Solomon's time the mines seem to have been worked not only by the Edomites but by the Kenizzites and Kenites, who were skilled metallurgists (cf. Tubal-cain, Gn 4^{22}, and Arab. *qain* 'a smith'), and the Hebrews probably acquired their knowledge of metals from these workers. It is stated in Chronicles that the Kenizzites lived in Ge-harashim, *i.e.* 'the Valley of Smiths' (cf. 1 Ch $4^{13.\ 14}$ R.V.m, Neh 11^{35}), which Glueck with good reason takes to be the Wadi Arabah, and in the preceding verse (4^{12}) we read of Ir-nahash ('the City of Copper'), which is probably to be identified with modern Khirbet Nahash ('the Copper Ruin'), near the north end of the Arabah. The valley must have been a hive of metal workers, and one of the most productive regions in the Near East.

Lachish.

The Fosse Temple.—Further excavation at this ancient Judæan site is at present hampered, owing partly to the time required for carefully examining all the material found, and partly to the unsettled conditions meanwhile in the Near East. When all such difficulties, however, are overcome, the Wellcome-Marston Expedition hopes to resume its valuable work. The recent reports on the temple which stood for two and a half centuries (*c.* 1475–1230 B.C.) in the Hyksos fosse, outside the city wall, and which seems to have been dedicated to native Syrian deities, show several correspondences with Hebrew ritual and worship, due no doubt to common Semitic tradition. We have mentioned some of these already. In addition, it may be stated that a number of lamps have been discovered in the cupboard adjoining the shrine, and their existence there reminds us of the close connexion in the Hebrew tabernacle between the lighting of the lamps and the burning of incense on the altar: 'Every morning when he (Aaron) dresseth the lamps, he shall burn incense' (Ex $30^{7.\ 8}$). Again, there has been found among the pottery on the floor near the altar a large bowl with a bridge across it, which has been identified as a foot-bath, and its presence at this particular spot seems to accord with the law for ceremonial ablutions in Hebrew sanctuaries: 'He (Moses) set the laver between the tent of meeting and the altar, and put water therein, to wash withal. And Moses and Aaron and his sons washed their hands and their feet thereat' (Ex $40^{30.\ 31}$). On the other hand, one important divergence from Hebrew custom lies in the apparent absence of anything corresponding to the Holy of Holies. The worshippers seem to have had access to the whole sanctuary. They brought their offerings in bowls, and were allowed to deposit them in the presence of the deities. This appears to have been the chief form of worship during the long period of the temple's existence, for the number of bowls, apart from other vessels, found in the building and in the refuse pits outside, amounts to no less than 1806.

Its Destruction.—The burning of the temple, and probably of the whole city, has been dated by Professor Albright, after pottery examination, to about 1230 B.C., and there is good reason to believe that this is correct. At the same time, the destruction cannot have been due, as he suggests,[1] to the Israelite entry into the land shortly before, for if we allow the necessary 'forty years' for the wilderness period, this would mean that the Exodus from Egypt took place during the reign of Ramesses II. (*c.* 1301–1234 B.C.), which is most improbable, to say the least—and there are other important reasons against such a date. The destruction was undoubtedly due, as the excavators themselves prefer to believe, to Merenptah's Raid, which we know from this Pharaoh's Victory Stela occurred in 1230 B.C., and was more widespread and devastating than commonly supposed. There is certainly evidence that Gezer was destroyed at the time, and this would involve Lachish and Ashkelon, with which that city was closely associated. Other cities, too, such as Kiriath-sepher, are known to have been laid waste near the end of the thirteenth century, and all the evidence clearly points, not to the Israelites, but to Merenptah's Egyptian hosts.

The Present North Wall of Jerusalem.

It has long been held by many scholars and archæologists that this is the wall commenced in A.D. 41 by Herod Agrippa I., being the one described in Josephus (*Wars*, v. 4) as the Third Wall of the city. It was built, according to Josephus, to enclose an extension of the city at this northern part, and though the work was stopped through the inter-

[1] *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, 194.

vention of the Roman authorities, it was resumed and hastily completed by the Jewish defenders in anticipation of the siege of A.D. 70. The discovery has now been made, through careful and extensive excavations carried out by R. W. Hamilton under the Department of Antiquities in Palestine,[1] that the present wall cannot be the one referred to by Josephus, as there is no evidence that it could have been founded or built earlier than the time of the Emperor Hadrian (*c.* A.D. 117–138), who settled a Roman colony in Jerusalem and gave the city the name Aelia Capitolina. Under the circumstances, therefore, the wall referred to by Josephus must have taken a different line, and must be the one whose ruined foundations were discovered by Dr. Robinson about a hundred years ago, which runs roughly parallel to the present wall but about a quarter of a mile north of it, and which was partially excavated in 1925–27 by Dr. E. L. Sukenik and Dr. L. A. Mayer. The discovery, of course, does not affect the question as to the location of Golgotha, which is known to have been 'outside the gate' (He 13^{12}), seeing that none of these two walls was in existence at the date of the Crucifixion, but the excavations have at last settled a much disputed controversy.

Hamilton has found that the earliest construction of the present north wall must be dated sometime 'between the foundation of Aelia and the late third or fourth century, A.D.'—probably about the end of the third century, judging by the sherds. Many of the blocks of masonry which had been at one time in some of the buildings of Herodian Jerusalem seem to have been brought and re-used in the wall.

The earliest structure discovered, dating from before the wall, is an underground aqueduct, about twenty inches wide, commencing below the wall foundation a little west of Herod's Gate, and running southward into the city. Its entrance beneath the wall is stopped up with rubble, but its course is clear and is paved with excellent flags. About fifty-one feet onward it opens into an inspection chamber, constructed later, one of the side stones of which contains the funerary inscription of a centurion named Tiberius Claudius Fatalis. The inscription has been placed by M. Avi-Yonah about the early second century A.D., but it can afford no evidence as to the date of the aqueduct itself.

[1] *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities*, x. 1. (1940), 1 ff.

Jehoiachin, King of Judah.

It is worthy of note that a Babylonian cuneiform record has recently been found, referring to the imprisonment or exile of this Judæan monarch in Babylon. According to Old Testament history, he succeeded his father, Jehoiakim, in 597 B.C. at the age of eighteen (2 K 24^{8}), and after a brief reign of three months surrendered to Nebuchadnezzar and was carried captive to Babylon, with his mother, his generals, his troops, and many inhabitants of Jerusalem. He remained in confinement there for thirty-seven years until released by the next king of Babylon, Evil-merodach, who gave him an honourable seat at the royal table (2 K $25^{27\text{-}30}$, Jer $52^{31\text{-}34}$). The Babylonian tablet, mentioning the king's captivity, has been translated and discussed by Ernst F. Wiedner in an article[2] in Vol. II. of *Mélanges Dussaud* (pp. 923–935, with five plates), and further reference to the subject is made in *Archiv für Orientforschung*.[3] We need not be surprised to find archæological discoveries confirming Israelite historical statements, seeing that the latter rest as a rule on early written sources contemporary, or nearly so, with the events narrated. This is undoubtedly true not only of the JE narratives, but of much of the material preserved in P. Referring to future archæology, Professor Albright says, 'We shall see a steady rise in respect for the historical significance of now neglected or despised passages and details in the Old and New Testaments.'[4]

[2] *Jojachin, König von Juda*, in *Babylonischen Keilinschrifttexten*.

[3] xiii. Heft 3 (1940), 180*a*.

[4] *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, 47.

Theology in Modern Verse.

By the Reverend Sidney Adamson, B.D., Sanquhar.

The man who speaks in poetry cannot be exhaustive, and he cannot be technical. Instead of approaching his point discursively, threading the maze of argument in logical progression, he must strike to the heart of his thought by a flash of insight. It was this that Chesterton meant by his remark: 'The central idea of poetry is that of guessing right, like a child.' Nevertheless, we may justly speak of theology in verse, for verse is theological when it treats of God; even though it presents no involved theory or close reasoning. Naturally, too, the many syllabled language of philosophers must give way to a simpler and perhaps a sweeter diction. Nor is this to say that the theological ideas borne by poetical writings are in any sense limited to trivialities or banalities of religious thought.

It may not seem easy at first sight to expound lyrically the conflict of God's word with sin; yet this is achieved most gracefully by Joseph Campbell in 'The Star.' He hoists the banner of his purpose at once, in his first lines:

> Through the roaring boughs of sin
> Burns a solitary star.
> It is of the cherubin,
> It has all the joys that are.

Subsequently he paints the blackness of the 'boughs of sin,' and contrasts with them the shining of the star, until we long to know what star it is and whence its power.

> Black the boughs against the air,
> Shaken with the wind of time:
> White the star, and cherub-fair,
> An arum lily in its prime.

Only in the last word of the last line are we answered, and then he reveals the nature of the light that penetrates the noise-thronged branches of evil:

> Hooded owls make ceasless moan
> Thro' the sin-excited boughs.
> On the golden finial-stone
> Crowning heaven's purple house
> Burns the star, remote, unstirred,
> Beacon of the holy Word.

Descriptive writing often causes a friction on the reader's patience by its very insistence on detail, and so fails of its own purpose. No such weakness mars 'The Star'; for each word leads us nearer the climax. There is a wisdom higher than mere cleverness, moreover, in keeping the dénouement (if we may so speak of a lyric) to the last word: for it carries a genuine appropriateness of finality. To such a technique no one of taste could deny the name of art; nor can we truly dismiss the poem's challenging statement from the ranks of theology.

This felicity of verbal style is common to several modern poets. They seem to have the knack to an extraordinary degree, of putting things 'just so.' Helen Parry Eden uses it to great effect, in her 'Afterthought on Apples.' Drawing a parallel between apples and human beings, ripe and unripe, she retains the metaphor in perfect fullness to the last, reaching a beautifully fitting conclusion in the prayer for a gentle death. She tells, for instance:

> How in my tardy season, making one
> Of a crude congregation, sour in sin,
> I nodded like a green-clad mandarin,
> Averse from all that savoured of the sun.

If 'a crude congregation, sour in sin,' aptly portrays the undeveloped understanding of religion which is characteristic of many folk in early life, how much more neatly do the following lines convey the maturing wisdom born of experience.

> But now throughout these last autumnal weeks
> What skyey gales mine arrogant station thresh,
> What sunbeams mellow my beshadowed cheeks,
> What steely storms cudgel mine obdurate flesh;
> Less loth am I to see my fellows launch
> Forth from my side into the air's abyss,
> Whose own stalk is
> Grown untenacious of its wonted branch.

The whole tenor of old age, its growing lightness of hold upon life, its loss of comrades gone before, and its decreasing reluctance to let slip the 'thin-spun thread,' are here. Best of all are the phrases of the closure; moderate of rhythm and tender of sound:

> Grant not my golden rind
> To the black starlings screaming in the mist.
> Nay, rather on some gentle day and bland
> Give Thou Thyself my stalk a gentle twist,
> Dear Lord, and I shall fall into Thy hand.

Although Hilaire Belloc's style is acceptedly unstrained, it too contains elements of this brilliant

touch with words. He does persuade us that courtesy (in the poem of that title) is a sacred virtue; and the weapons of his persuasion are two. First is the inspired devotion which leads him to select the Infant Christ as his crowning picture; second is the utter simplicity and infallible rightness of the words he uses for every subject. He claims in the first verse,

> Of Courtesy, it is much less
> Than Courage of Heart or Holiness,
> Yet in my Walks it seems to me
> That the Grace of God is in Courtesy.

This thesis he seeks to prove by referring to three pictures hung in the Hall of the monks of Storrington; representing respectively the Annunciation, Visitation, and Consolation, of the Mother Mary; and in every one of which he finds the soft radiance of courtesy.

> The first was of Saint Gabriel;
> On Wings a-flame from Heaven he fell;
> And as he went upon one knee
> He shone with Heavenly Courtesy.
>
> Our Lady out of Nazareth rode—
> It was Her month of heavy load;
> Yet was Her face both great and kind,
> For Courtesy was in Her Mind.
>
> The third it was our Little Lord,
> Whom all the Kings in arms adored;
> He was so small you could not see
> His large intent of Courtesy.

If anything is more important in the appreciation of Christmas than another, it is surely the 'large intent' of the tiny one whose destiny was already marked with the utmost majesty; and to make plain even one aspect of this intent is the vital task of Christmas preaching, no less than the prime theological value of the Infancy.

With 'The March,' a composition of J. C. Squire's, more sombre and passionate themes are expounded. We commonly and rightly pay a tribute of grateful respect to the past, on whose hard-won stepping stones we walk so easily, and whose bitter sacrifices are the firm foundation of our freedoms. We, too, lay down in our current service the bases of future progress. Thus the march of the generations is identified with the motif of sacrifice. This need not be a strictly religious outlook, and on the contrary was the subject of a purely materialistic philosophy of history, Winwoode Read's 'The Martyrdom of Man.' Only through religion, however, can it be seen in its true glory. So it is that Squire gives new spiritual dignity to what is an accepted historical fact, by identifying Christ with humanity's adventure. Paramount in the 'army of our hundred thousand dead,' outstanding among the great march-past of ghostly figures, he catches sight of one Face, with burning eyes full of wordless meaning.

> A hundred thousand dead, with firm and noiseless tread,
> All shadowy-grey yet solid, with faces grey and ghast,
> And by the house they went, and all their brows were bent
> Straight forward; and they passed, and passed, and passed, and passed.
>
> But O there came a place, and O there came a face,
> That clenched my heart to see it, and suddenly turned my way;
> And in the Face that turned I saw two eyes that burned,
> Never forgotten eyes, and they had things to say.

In plain words, he has made poetry out of the Atonement, a highly specialized concept in the philosophy of religion. Quite different is the spiritual background of Lord Alfred Douglas' lyric, 'A Prayer.' In four stanzas he depicts in turn the many voices of Nature, and experience, which make plain the existence of a divine Architect of the Universe; culminating in the last verse with the appeal of Jesus for men's faith. In almost liturgical refrain the concluding line of each verse makes the sad confession of blindness and deafness to this evidence, and the cry, 'Oh! open Thou mine eyes.'

> There have been many stars to guide my feet,
> Often the delicate moon, hearing my sighs,
> Has rent the clouds and shown a silver street;
> And I saw not. Oh! open Thou mine eyes

The elevation of the child by our Lord, in token of the true outlook of faith, trust, and frankness, has left us with no mean problem. The distinction between childlikeness in the more creditable sense, and childishness in the less, is not easy to mark, and the boundary is easily trespassed. Here is a region where theology is at baulk, without illustration; and the selection of a pure and accurate illustration is not so much a solution as a problem itself. Once again we may have recourse to the imagery of the versifiers. There is no borderline danger, no blurred sentimentalism, about 'The Toys'; for Coventry Patmore tells in it a story which has happened to most fathers, if not indeed to all. The boy has offended his father by dis-

obedience, not once but three times ; and has been sent to bed, punished and without the good-night kiss of parenthood. Then the natural affection of the father suggests that the child may lose sleep in weeping. Visiting the room where the boy lies brings disclosures and revelations. The little fellow is asleep with tears on his lashes, but :

on a table drawn beside his head,
He had put, within his reach,
A box of counters, and a red-vein'd stone,
A piece of glass abraded by the beach
And six or seven shells,
A bottle with bluebells
And two French copper coins, ranged there with careful art,
To comfort his sad heart.

So when that night I pray'd
To God, I wept, and said :
Ah, when at last we lie with tranced breath,
Not vexing Thee in death,
And Thou rememberest of what toys
We made our joys,
How weakly understood,
Thy great commanded good,
Then, fatherly not less
Than I whom Thou hast moulded from the clay.
Thou'lt leave Thy wrath and say,
'I will be sorry for their childishness.'

One must not lay too much stress on the distinction we make between the words childlikeness and childishness, if one depends upon this poem for an illustration ; but there is no doubt about the clarity of the parable. Wider comprehension of God's Fatherhood and our adoption cannot but emerge from it.

Something of a pre-eminence in the expression of religious ideas has been achieved by Studdert-Kennedy. Many feel that the 'second coming' of Christ must be a purely spiritual notion ; a return of the will and mind of Christ into men as individuals and into the Church as a community. To clothe their opinion in words may be difficult to perform satisfactorily. But they can serve themselves heir to the skill of our poet, who says :

When in the darkest depths the patient miner striving,
Feels in his arms the vigour of the Lord,
Strikes for a Kingdom and his King's arriving,
Holding his pick more splendid than the sword
. . . . . .
When all the world looks up because of Him ;
Then will He come with meekness for His glory,
God in a workman's jacket as before,
Living again the eternal gospel story,
Sweeping the shavings from His workshop floor.

There is no small triumph in creating a poem. Whatever the idea, to clothe it in fit and rhythmic speech is a difficult art, as all who have tried can tell. The triumph is doubly great if the idea be religious. To us in these days that have brought a lining-up of the forces of anarchy against the forces of religion, law, and order verse of such a power is a true source of blessing. Reading it, we are confirmed in our faith in the ultimate decencies, and are strengthened in our determination to stand by them.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Jesus and Paul.

The War has dammed the flow of German theological literature, and I regret the loss. For, despite the indignation we rightly feel regarding the methods of German warfare, and the aims of its policy, and distressed as we may be that some of its theologians are approving of these methods and that policy, and most are acquiescent, we do not want a temporary estrangement to suspend our permanent recognition of the fellowship in thought and life in Christ of all believers. It was my painful duty in my last contribution to The Expository Times to call attention to a lamentable instance of national prejudice in Dr. Martin Dibelius' charge of hypocrisy against us. It is all the more a pleasure that I can now call attention to what in my judgment is a valuable contribution to a subject of crucial importance, the relation of Paul to Jesus.[1] It has not reached me through the usual channels, but has been sent to me 'with the author's kind regards.' He is German though now in Zürich. He was for a short time a student at New College,

[1] *Jesus und Paulus*, von Professor D. W. Kümmel. Theologische Blätter, August-September 1940, par. 211–231 (J. C. Hinrichs Verlag, in Leipzig, 61).

London; and this token of friendliness in these times seems to me to be worth mentioning.

After a brief reference to the discussion of the subject in 1907 between W. Wrede and Ad. Jülicher, the author mentions the revival of the discussion in recent years, and gives as its reason the importance of the circle of problems connected with it at the present time, *i.e.*, the 'form-historical' insight into the 'kerygmatical' character of the Synoptic tradition. Here he seems to show the reserve with which he writes, for another factor needs to be recognized, the Anti-Semitism, for which Jesus may be tolerated, but not Paul. His consideration of the relevant literature must be passed over. He follows Bultmann in setting the question in a threefold sense. (1) How far was Paul determined in forming his thoughts by the historical Jesus, either directly or by the mediation of the primitive community? (2) How in fact is the theology of Paul related to the preaching of Jesus, apart from any causal significance of the preaching of Jesus for Paul? (3) What significance for the theology of Paul has the fact of the historical Jesus? (*Glauben und Verstehen*, 188, quoted p. 212). As most important, Kümmel deals mainly with question (2), but recognizes that the answer to the two others is necessary to an understanding. As regards (1) he affirms that while Paul has a few references to the words of Jesus, and assigns to them a higher authority than to his own, yet in his main doctrines he is not directly dependent on the words of Jesus (2). Much more important is the answer to (3). In his doctrine of the person Paul used mythical forms of thought, the origin of which is disputable, yet, while the details of the life and teaching were for Paul of minor importance, the fact of the humanity of Christ was important, because 'in this human being, his life, death, and resurrection God has brought about the final age' (*Endzeit*, p. 214). In Christ, proclaimed by Paul as Son of God, God had acted. As regards (2) is there a fundamental, essential difference between the teaching of Jesus and the doctrine of Paul? About the formal difference there can be no doubt. Jesus' teaching is simpler and less systematic than Paul's. 'A really decisive difference lies here, that Paul stood in a quite other historical situation as regards salvation than Jesus' (p. 216). For between Paul and Jesus were not only the facts of the death and the resurrection of Jesus, but the formation of the community by the gift of the Spirit at Pentecost—evidence of the final age. 'Paul cannot but witness, as did the primitive community, that God had exalted the earthly man Jesus by death and resurrection to heavenly glory, and that this exalted man was, therefore, now the heavenly Lord, whom all the world must serve, and who alone could give God's salvation' (p. 217). Paul found the Church with its two sacraments in existence. Whether Jesus intended to found the Church or not, He gathered a group of men around Him to preach the coming Kingdom of God, and by the gift of the Spirit that group knew itself as a community distinct from the Jewish. While the final coming was still expected as future, the presence of the time of salvation had become more real. In the central matter Paul did not advance beyond Jesus further than the historical situation demanded, and 'no fundamental differences exist in the conception of God, in the teaching about the law, in the realization of salvation' (p. 222) however the theological exposition may in form differ. Even if the differences are for the most part explicable by the new situation and Paul's theological characteristics they cannot be ignored, or minimised. The decisive difference lies here. Jesus knew Himself to be the God determined messenger and bringer of the final salvation, 'while Paul is and wishes to be nothing but the servant and messenger of this Christ, who does not bring God's action, only declares it' (p. 230). The final sentence, summing up the whole argument is: 'He who refuses Paul because he declares what came to be in Christ, has herewith also refused Christ' (p. 231). This, in my judgment, convincing argument is set forth with ample learning, sound judgment, keen discernment, meticulous care of statement and impressive conviction. I have read the article with zest and commend it with boldness.

A. E. Garvie.

London.

William Law.

This finely produced study[1] of an Englishman who has been called our greatest prose mystic would be noteworthy at any time. Its appearance now is a hopeful and indeed astonishing occurrence. For it was published during the opening weeks of the war by a member of a persecuted Church under an un-Christian dictatorship by a leading Munich firm, and it is moreover the first introduction to the German religious public of our William Law, presenting on the whole a more comprehensive account of his mystical experience and affinities

[1] *Die Stufenfolge des Mystischen Erlebnisses bei William Law* (1686–1761), by Konrad Minkner (Munich, 1939; M.6).

than has yet been attempted in this country. To the present reviewer it has been a peculiar satisfaction, inasmuch as Dr. Minkner has made excellent and critical use of his own published studies in Law's doctrines and their relation to his German master, Jacob Boehme (particularly to those incorporated with the *Selected Mystical Writings of William Law,* 1938). Knowledge of the book was brought here by the monthly journal of the small German Quaker community, and a copy was fortunately secured through Holland, just before its invasion, by the enterprise of the London Library. Incidentally we know through American members of the same Society that quite recently *Der Quäker* has been circulating regularly among the German Quakers, who are able to carry on without serious difficulty their religious and social activities. And through this source and from refugee pastors in this country it appears that the all-pervading Nazi censorship has been as a rule remarkably tolerant of Christian literature, so long as it has no obvious political references.

Dr. Minkner, the son of a Mission-superintendent, is a Lutheran with pronounced Catholic sympathies. His book was written as a degree thesis under the inspiration and guidance of Professor Friedrich Heiler of Marburg University, whose great work on *Prayer* is known and valued here. Evelyn Underhill read the author's manuscript, and her *Mysticism* is much used and quoted, as are also the volumes of Henri Brémond's French studies. The result is a work of permanent value to the student of William Law as well as to all lovers of the great mystics of the Church. Fresh ground has been broken in the following directions: (1) By frequent and happy quotations from the *Christian Perfection* (1726) and the *Serious Call* (1729) we are shown good evidence for believing that Law's experience was essentially mystical before his contact with the writings of Boehme (*c.* 1735); (2) for almost the first time emphasis is laid on the valuable modifications, from the standpoint of the central Catholic tradition, which Law introduced into Boehme's daring theology; (3) fresh evidence is given for Law's loyalty throughout his life, in spite of his later leanings to the Quaker position, to the sacraments and institutions of the Anglican Church; (4) we have many welcome indications of his debt to great Catholic mystics, such as Ruysbroek, St. John of the Cross, Malebranche, and St. Francis de Sales. The author appears to have some real insight into the nature of the soul's progress towards the ineffable goal of the *unio mystica.* Moreover, the truly super-national as well as super-confessional character of the book may well make it a link in the re-creation on a surer footing of our outward fellowship with our German brothers in Christ, when the hour of liberation comes.

STEPHEN HOBHOUSE.

Broxbourne.

Contributions and Comments.

The Element of Abruptness in the Teaching of Jesus.

ALTHOUGH we may have travelled a long way from the portrait of Jesus painted by Renan, of an 'amiable and beautiful prophet,' riding about on 'a long-eyelashed, gentle mule,' preaching a mild and effeminate theology, we may yet overlook the element of sternness and abruptness in the manner as well as the matter of Jesus' teaching. It seems sometimes as if He were deliberately seeking to shock His hearers by the sudden alteration of a familiar quotation or by an abrupt answer to a question.

One such instance has often been remarked upon. At Nazareth (Lk $4^{16ff.}$) Jesus read, from the roll handed to Him, the opening words of Is 61. It was a passage familiar to His hearers and one which many of them would know by heart. With their minds and probably with their lips also they would be following the well-known words: '. . . to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord and the day of vengeance . . .'. They looked up, startled and aroused, for the reader had broken off in the middle of a sentence. 'And he folded up the roll and handed it back.'

Another instance of the abrupt interruption of a familiar quotation occurs in the account in Mark and Matthew of Jesus' enunciation of 'the first commandment of all.' The bystanders would know at once, as soon as they heard the question, what Jesus' answer would be. Every orthodox Jew, as soon as he knows enough Hebrew, learns the Shema' by heart. Not only the opening words but the whole paragraph (Dt 6^{4-9}) is repeated daily

and at every Sabbath service. An Austrian refugee, a youth of sixteen, told me recently that he could repeat the Shema' in Hebrew in twenty seconds. The repetition seems mechanical to us (though not more mechanical than many Christians' repetition of the Lord's Prayer), and I have noticed at Sabbath morning services how even young boys and girls will close their books when the moment comes for the recitation of the Shema'; some of them will shut their eyes and allow their bodies to sway to and fro as they repeat the sacred words. For one to interrupt the saying of the Shema', or to make an alteration even in so much as a syllable, would be an audacious and startling act.

Such was the state of mind of Jesus' hearers. As soon as He began to answer: 'Hear, O Israel. The Lord our God, the Lord is one. And thou shalt love . . .', their eyes would be closed and their lips would be repeating the words with Him. But while their thoughts were already running on to: 'And these words which I command unto thee this day shall be upon thine heart . . .', Jesus startled them by abruptly breaking into the passage with a quotation from Lv 19: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.'

On yet another occasion Jesus interrupted His own sequence of thought and speech. Burney has taught us to see the poetry of the Parable of the Two Foundations. It is a complete and perfect poem of two stanzas.

The first stanza runs:

Everyone therefore which heareth these words of mine,
and doeth them,
Shall be likened unto a wise man,
which built his house upon the rock;
And the rain descended,
and the floods came,
and the winds blew,
and beat upon that house;
And it fell not,
for it was founded upon the rock.

The second stanza follows the first exactly, until there is a sudden break in the last line:

And everyone that heareth these words of mine,
and doeth them not,
Shall be likened unto a foolish man,
which built his house upon the sand;
And the rain descended,
and the floods came,
and the winds blew,
and smote upon that house;
And it fell;
And great was the fall thereof.

Jesus' hearers, their minds lulled by the repetition of the words of the first stanza, would be expecting the sequence: 'For it was founded upon the sand,' to be startled by the sudden transition from poetry to prose, ably rendered by Moffatt: 'And down it fell—with a mighty crash!'

These instances may throw light upon the abrupt nature of many of Jesus' words and actions in the Synoptic Gospels. This characteristic has been attributed to the compilers of the Gospels or to the early preachers, who needed only a short and abrupt paradigm to express some thought of Jesus. But it may well be reminiscent of the actual practice of Jesus. Men demanded a sign (Mk $8^{11ff.}$) and expected Him to enter into a theological discussion. But Mark records only a short and decisive refusal: 'There shall no sign be given unto this generation. And he left them.' We can well believe that, after a few experiences of Jesus' abruptness, 'no man after that durst ask him any question' (Mk 12^{34b}).

We may notice finally that Jesus could be as abrupt in His questions as in His answers and His quotations of familiar words. 'How think ye?' 'What think ye?' he asked (Mt 18^{12} 21^{28}). By this means He sought to stir His hearers into thinking for themselves.

HAROLD A. GUY.
Downham Market, Norfolk.

Revelation.

IN his article on 'Revelation' in the July 1940 issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, Professor C. H. Dodd briefly defends the doctrine that there is a 'general' revelation of God to mankind apart from this 'special' revelation in Christ attested to the Church in the Bible. His arguments are summed up in a paragraph in which he says: 'It is, in fact, impossible to isolate the Church, the field of God's special revelation in Christ, as if it were an inviolable *enclave* within humanity. Its centre is in Christ, but it has no ultimate circumference short of the whole of mankind. . . . The Holy Spirit works in the Church, but to deny His operation in the world would be to put a limit to the power and love of . . . Christ.'

All this, however, is simply not in question in the main contemporary controversy about 'general revelation,' that in which Karl Barth so vigorously opposes the doctrine defended by Professor Dodd.

Nothing that Professor Dodd says in this key paragraph cannot be paralleled by exactly similar statements from Barth himself. For example, in *The Church and the Political Problem of our Day*, the starting-point of Barth's whole argument is the affirmation that 'The One whom the Church sees as her comfort and hope at the beginning and end of *her* paths, she sees also at the beginning and end of every path. Him whom she knows as *her* Lord, she knows as the Lord of *all* men' (pp. 7–8).

It is not uncommon to find this work described as marking in some ways a departure from Barth's usual positions; but the sentences quoted express ideas that are anything but new to him. A short section in the first half-volume of his *Church Dogmatics*, which appeared so far back as 1932, is entirely devoted to this theme. 'The Church,' he says here, 'is not outside beside God, and the world is not inside apart from God. . . . The world from the Church's standpoint cannot be the victim of its godlessness, cannot be taken seriously in its godlessness; so far and so long as the Church takes this attitude she only proves that she herself does not seriously believe in the Word of God. . . . Not in the light of nature but in the light of grace there is, not a profane realm self-enclosed and guarded, but only one called in question by the Word of God, by the Gospel, by God's claim, judgment, and blessing, one abandoned to its own legalism and to its own gods only in a preliminary and limited way' (*The Doctrine of the Word of God*, 176–7).

Barth explicitly admits, moreover, that the missionary appeal of the Church would be impossible without this previous work of God in the world as yet outside the Church—without the missionary's belief that the Holy Spirit was 'there before him.' 'Preaching among coloured and white heathens' presupposes that they are 'already dealt with as heathen, already drawn into Christ's sphere of power' (*ib.*, 175).

Nor are these merely reluctant and incidental 'admissions' from Barth that there is a measure of truth among his opponents. Christ's care for the world as well as the Church is an essential doctrine of his own; and his dispute with the advocate of 'general revelation' is precisely about whether his view or theirs expresses most adequately this universality of the Lordship of Christ. In the section of his Dogmatics which deals explicitly with 'general revelation' and 'natural theology,' his main charge against his opponents is that their 'general revelation' is conceived as the subject of 'a dialogue in which the unbelief of the partner in the dialogue is taken seriously, *i.e.* in which he is addressed as a child of the world and is apprehended in his unbelief' (*ib.*, 32). The Christian must work on higher assumptions than that about the secret work of the Spirit in the hearts of 'unbelievers.'

This dispute is not about the *fact* of Christ's Lordship over the 'heathen' world, but about its *nature*. And this question only emerges out of the realm of theory and acquires practical significance when we consider its bearings on *what the Church must say* when it ventures to speak to the 'outside' world. The advocates of 'general revelation' hold that the Church must assume that the world is not yet ready to hear the Christian gospel in its fullness, but is able to hear, and ought to be given, something a little less. On Barth's view, the fact that Christ is already Lord of the world means that the Church can and must tell the world this fact, that is, that it can and must preach the gospel to the world; and it means nothing else. Christ so rules and cares for the world that we can cherish the hope that this proclamation of the pure gospel will not be in vain; and the response of the world to the gospel is the only 'sign' of Christ's Lordship over it in which the Church is warranted to show the least interest. Says Barth: '"*All* power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth." He who says that is Lord both of the Church *and* of the world. But only as the Lord of the *Church* will it be possible for Jesus to be manifest to us; as the Lord of the world He is *hidden* from us. We cannot get a knowledge of His government from the world's events, though we are certainly concerned there with none other power than His. . . . Only in the Lord of Scripture and thereby of the Church can we seek and worship the Lord of history. And if we are going to be obedient to the Lord of the *world*, that can only be by our obeying the Lord of the *Church*' (*Credo*, 191–2).

Barth has surely taken pains enough to make it clear what he denies and what he does not deny. But he is so very seldom carefully read.

ARTHUR N. PRIOR.

New Zealand.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.